arXiv:1504.03838v3 [math.NT] 27 Oct 2016

REDUCTIONS OF GALOIS REPRESENTATIONS OF SLOPE 1

SHALINI BHATTACHARYA, EKNATH GHATE, AND SANDRA ROZENSZTAJN

Abstract. We compute the reductions of irreducible crystalline two-dimensional representations of $G_{\mathbb{Q}_p}$ of slope 1, for primes $p \geq 5$, and all weights. We describe the semisimplification of the reductions completely. In particular, we show that the reduction is often reducible. We also investigate whether the extension obtained is peu or très ramifiée, in the relevant reducible non-semisimple cases. The proof uses the compatibility between the p-adic and mod p Local Langlands Correspondences, and involves a detailed study of the reductions of both the standard and non-standard lattices in certain p-adic Banach spaces.

1. Introduction

Let p be an odd prime. This paper is concerned with computing the reductions of certain crystalline two-dimensional representations of the local Galois group $G_{\mathbb{Q}_p}$. The first computations of the reduction in positive slope, after Edixhoven [Edi92], were carried out by Breuil in [Bre03b], for weights at most $2p+1$. The reductions are also known for slopes which are large compared to the weight by Berger-Li-Zhu [BLZ04]; see also [YY] for results using similar techniques. In the other direction, the reductions have also recently been computed for small fractional slopes, namely, for slopes in $(0,1)$ by Buzzard-Gee [BG09], [BG13], and for slopes in $(1,2)$ in [BG15], under a mild hypothesis. In this paper we compute the reduction in the important missing case of integral slope 1. As far as we know, the shape of the reduction is not known for all weights, for any other (positive) integral slope.

Let us introduce some notation. Let E be a finite extension field of $\mathbb{Q}_p$ and let v be the valuation of $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_p$ normalized so that $v(p) = 1$. Let $a_p \in E$ with $v(a_p) > 0$ and let $k \geq 2$. Let V_{k,a_p} be the irreducible crystalline representation of $G_{\mathbb{Q}_p}$ with Hodge-Tate weights $(0, k-1)$ and slope $v(a_p) > 0$ such that $D_{\mathrm{cris}}(V_{k,a_p}^*) = D_{k,a_p}$, where $D_{k,a_p} = Ee_1 \oplus Ee_2$ is the filtered φ-module as defined in [Ber11, §2.3]. The semisimplification $\bar{V}_{k,a_p}^{ss}$ of the reduction $\bar{V}_{k,a_p}$ with respect to a lattice in V_{k,a_p} is independent of the choice of the lattice. Let $\omega = \omega_1$ and ω_2 denote the fundamental characters of level 1 and 2 respectively. Let $\mathrm{ind}(\omega_2^a)$ denote the representation of $G_{\mathbb{Q}_p}$ obtained by inducing the character ω_2^a, for $a \in \mathbb{Z}$, from $G_{\mathbb{Q}_{p^2}}$ to $G_{\mathbb{Q}_p}$; it is irreducible if $p+1 \nmid a$. Finally, let μ_x be the unramified character of $G_{\mathbb{Q}_p}$ taking (geometric) Frobenius at p to $x \in \bar{\mathbb{F}}_p^\times$.

The following theorem describes the reduction $\bar{V}_{k,a_p}^{ss}$ when the slope $v(a_p)$ is equal to 1, for all primes $p > 3$.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $p > 3$, let $k \geq 2p+2$ and let $r = k-2 \equiv b \mod (p-1)$, with $2 \leq b \leq p$. Suppose that the slope $v(a_p) = 1$. Then $\bar{V}_{k,a_p}^{ss}$ is as follows:*

$$b = 2 \quad \Longrightarrow \quad \begin{cases} \mathrm{ind}(\omega_2^{b+1}), & \text{if } v\left(\frac{a_p}{p} - \binom{r}{2}\frac{p}{a_p}\right) < v(r-2) \\ \mu_\lambda \cdot \omega^b \oplus \mu_{\lambda^{-1}} \cdot \omega, & \text{if } v\left(\frac{a_p}{p} - \binom{r}{2}\frac{p}{a_p}\right) = v(r-2), \ \text{with } \lambda = \overline{\frac{2}{2-r}\left(\frac{a_p}{p} - \binom{r}{2}\frac{p}{a_p}\right)} \\ \mathrm{ind}(\omega_2^{b+p}), & \text{if } v\left(\frac{a_p}{p} - \binom{r}{2}\frac{p}{a_p}\right) > v(r-2), \end{cases}$$

$$3 \leq b \leq p-1 \quad \Longrightarrow \quad \begin{cases} \mu_\lambda \cdot \omega^b \oplus \mu_{\lambda^{-1}} \cdot \omega, & \text{if } p \nmid r-b, \ \text{with } \lambda = \overline{\frac{b}{b-r} \cdot \frac{a_p}{p}} \in \bar{\mathbb{F}}_p^\times \\ \mathrm{ind}(\omega_2^{b+1}), & \text{if } p \mid r-b, \end{cases}$$

$$b = p \quad \Longrightarrow \quad \begin{cases} \mathrm{ind}(\omega_2^{b+p}), & \text{if } p \nmid r-b \\ \mu_\lambda \cdot \omega \oplus \mu_{\lambda^{-1}} \cdot \omega, & \text{if } p \mid r-b, \ \text{with } \lambda + \frac{1}{\lambda} = \overline{\frac{a_p}{p} - \frac{r-p}{a_p}} \in \bar{\mathbb{F}}_p. \end{cases}$$

Remark 1.2. We have:

- Theorem 1.1 describes the reduction $\bar{V}_{k,a_p}^{ss}$ completely for slope $v(a_p) = 1$ and primes $p \geq 5$. The results in the theorem match with all previous known results for weights $2 < k \leq 2p+1$ summarized in [Ber11], so the theorem could therefore have been stated for weights $k > 2$.[1]
- It is a classical fact that the reduction is reducible in the ordinary case, that is, when the slope is 0. The theorem shows that the reduction $\bar{V}_{k,a_p}^{ss}$ is often reducible when the slope is 1. For example, the reduction is reducible for the congruence classes $3 \leq b \leq p-1$ if $p \nmid r-b$. This behaviour at the integral slopes $\{0\} \cup \{1\}$ contrasts with the behaviour of the reduction for fractional slopes $v(a_p) \in (0,1) \cup (1,2)$, where $\bar{V}_{k,a_p}$ is mostly irreducible.
- However, when $v(a_p) = 1$, the theorem shows that in each congruence class of weights mod $(p-1)$ there are further congruence classes of weights mod p where $\bar{V}_{k,a_p}$ is irreducible.
- A surprising trichotomy occurs for $b = 2$. This seems to be a more complicated manifestation of the dichotomy that occurs for weights $r \equiv 1 \mod (p-1)$ when $v(a_p) = \frac{1}{2}$ in [BG13].

The proof of Theorem 1.1 uses the compatibility of the p-adic and mod p Local Langlands Correspondences, with respect to the process of reduction [Ber10]. This compatibility allows one to reduce the reduction problem to one on the 'automorphic side', namely, to computing the reduction of a lattice in a certain Banach space. Let $G = \mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{Q}_p)$ and let $B(V_{k,a_p})$ be the unitary G-Banach space associated to V_{k,a_p} by the p-adic Local Langlands Correspondence. The reduction $\overline{B(V_{k,a_p})}^{ss}$ of a lattice in this Banach space coincides with the image of $\bar{V}_{k,a_p}^{ss}$ under the (semisimple) mod p Local Langlands Correspondence defined in [Bre03b]. Since the mod p correspondence is by definition injective, it suffices to compute the reduction $\overline{B(V_{k,a_p})}^{ss}$.

---

[1] Recent work by Arsovski [Ars15] includes a study of the reduction $\bar{V}_{k,a_p}^{ss}$ when the slope is 1, for $b \neq 3$, p, though the reduction is not uniquely specified there.

Let $K = \mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{Z}_p)$, a maximal compact open subgroup of $G = \mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{Q}_p)$, and let $Z = \mathbb{Q}_p^\times$ be the center of G. Let $X = KZ\backslash G$ be the (vertices of the) Bruhat-Tits tree associated to G. The module $\mathrm{Sym}^r\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_p^2$, for $r = k-2$, carries a natural action of KZ, and the projection

$$KZ\backslash(G \times \mathrm{Sym}^{k-2}\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_p^2) \to KZ\backslash G = X$$

defines a local system on X. The smooth representation of G

$$\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G \mathrm{Sym}^{k-2}\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_p^2$$

consists of all sections $f : G \to \mathrm{Sym}^{k-2}\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_p^2$ of this local system which are compactly supported mod KZ. There is a G-equivariant Hecke operator T acting on this space of sections. Let Π_{k,a_p} be the locally algebraic representation of G defined by taking the cokernel of $T - a_p$ acting on the above space. Let Θ_{k,a_p} be the image of the integral sections $\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G \mathrm{Sym}^{k-2}\bar{\mathbb{Z}}_p^2$ in Π_{k,a_p}. Then $B(V_{k,a_p})$ is the completion $\hat{\Pi}_{k,a_p}$ of Π_{k,a_p} with respect to the lattice Θ_{k,a_p}. The completion $\hat{\Theta}_{k,a_p}$, and sometimes by abuse of notation Θ_{k,a_p} itself, is called the standard lattice in $B(V_{k,a_p})$. We have $\overline{B(V_{k,a_p})}^{ss} \cong \bar{\hat{\Theta}}_{k,a_p}^{ss} \cong \bar{\Theta}_{k,a_p}^{ss}$.

Thus, to compute $\bar{V}_{k,a_p}^{ss}$, it suffices to compute the reduction $\bar{\Theta}_{k,a_p}^{ss}$ of Θ_{k,a_p}. There are two main steps. First, we study a quotient P of $\mathrm{Sym}^{k-2}\bar{\mathbb{F}}_p^2$ whose Jordan-Hölder factors provide an upper bound on the possible Jordan-Hölder factors that can contribute to $\bar{\Theta}_{k,a_p}^{ss}$. This is fairly routine and is done in Section 3. It turns out that P has 3 (and sometimes 2) Jordan-Hölder factors.

Second, we determine the eigenspaces of the Hecke operator T through which each of these Jordan-Hölder factors contribute to $\bar{\Theta}_{k,a_p}^{ss}$, if at all. This involves some delicate spectral analysis of the Hecke operator T and is the hardest part of the argument. The thrust of this analysis can be summarized as follows: we either 'eliminate' all but one Jordan-Hölder factor of P, or eliminate all but two Jordan-Hölder factors of P that 'pair up' nicely under the mod p Local Langlands Correspondence. In the former case, $\bar{\Theta}_{k,a_p}$ is generically a supersingular representation and $\bar{V}_{k,a_p}$ is irreducible. In the latter case, $\bar{\Theta}_{k,a_p}^{ss}$ is generically a direct sum of principal series representations and $\bar{V}_{k,a_p}^{ss}$ is reducible. There are additional complications. For instance, if the dimension of the sole surviving Jordan-Hölder factor of P in the former case is equal to $p-1$, it is also possible for $\bar{\Theta}_{k,a_p}^{ss}$ to be a direct sum of principal series, in which case $\bar{V}_{k,a_p}^{ss}$ is reducible with the inertia subgroup I_p acting by scalars.

In order to carry out this spectral analysis, we must hunt for certain explicit rational sections f, respectively $f^\pm$, of the cover above, and use the explicit formula for the Hecke operator T to show that $(T-a_p)f$, respectively $(T-a_p)f^\pm$, is integral with non-zero reduction of a relatively simple form. In particular, we require that either the image of $\overline{(T-a_p)f}$ generates $\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G J$, for some Jordan-Hölder factor J of P, or that $\overline{(T-a_p)f^\pm}$ generates $(T-\lambda^{\pm 1})(\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G J^\pm)$, for some $\lambda \in \bar{\mathbb{F}}_p^\times$ and some pair of Jordan-Hölder factors $J^\pm$ of P. In the former case, an easy argument shows that J does not contribute to $\bar{\Theta}_{k,a_p}$, so is 'eliminated', and in the latter case the factors $J^\pm$ 'pair up' nicely.

Note that neither the Jordan-Holder factors J, $J^{\pm}$ nor the 'eigenvalue' λ are specified in advance, which makes even starting this analysis rather difficult.

The spectral analysis is carried out for the congruence classes $a \in \{1, 2, \dots, p-1\}$ of r mod $(p-1)$ in three batches. The generic case $3 \leq a = b \leq p-1$ is treated first in Section 4. The cases $a = 1$ (so $b = p$) and $a = 2$ (so $b = 2$) are more complicated and require special treatment (see Sections 5, 6). Generally speaking, the explicit functions f we use are supported mod KZ on a ball of radius at most 2 centered at the origin of the tree. But to establish the trichotomy in the case $b = 2$, we work with functions f supported mod KZ on a ball of radius $v(r-2)+1$ centered at the origin, which may be arbitrarily large depending on the valuation of $r-2$. Moreover, the trichotomy we establish when $b = 2$ shows that each of the three possibilities for $\bar{V}^{ss}_{k,a_p}|_{I_p}$ allowed by the structure of P in this case and the mod p Local Langlands Correspondence actually does occur.

As already remarked, Theorem 1.1 shows that $\bar{V}_{k,a_p}$ is often reducible. This gives rise to a couple of subtler questions concerning the reduction, which do not seem to have been addressed for the crystalline representations V_{k,a_p} treated so far in the literature, perhaps primarily because the reduction $\bar{V}_{k,a_p}$ in these cases was found to be generically irreducible. We describe these two question now.

First, if $\bar{V}^{ss}_{k,a_p}$ is isomorphic to $\omega \oplus 1$, up to a twist, then by a well-known result of Ribet, there is a lattice which is unique up to homothety inside V_{k,a_p} that reduces to a non-split extension of 1 by ω, up to the same twist. One may ask whether this extension is "peu ramifiée" or "très ramifiée" in the sense of Serre [Ser87]. The answer does not depend on the choice of the lattice or the choice of the basis. In the context of slope $v(a_p) = 1$ and Theorem 1.1, this question arises in exactly two cases:

(1) $b = 2$, $r \geq p+1$, $v\left(\frac{a_p}{p} - \binom{r}{2}\frac{p}{a_p}\right) = v(r-2)$ and $\lambda = \overline{\frac{2}{2-r}\left(\frac{a_p}{p} - \binom{r}{2}\frac{p}{a_p}\right)} = \pm\bar{1}$, so

$$\overline{\frac{a_p}{p}} = \pm\overline{\frac{r}{2}} \quad \text{or} \quad \overline{\frac{a_p}{p}} = \pm\overline{(1-r)},$$

(2) $b = p-1$, $r \geq 2p-2$, $p \nmid r-b$ and $\lambda = \overline{\frac{1}{r+1} \cdot \frac{a_p}{p}} = \pm\bar{1}$, so

$$\overline{\frac{a_p}{p}} = \pm\overline{(r+1)}.$$

Section 7 of this paper is primarily concerned with providing an answer to this question. The following theorem summarizes our results. To state it, note that the two roots $\overline{\frac{a_p}{p}}$ of the quadratic equation $\lambda = \pm\bar{1}$ in case (1) above are distinct if and only if $r \not\equiv 2/3 \mod p$. We settle this question for most cases when $r \not\equiv 2/3 \mod p$ in case (1), and for all r in case (2), as follows.

Theorem 1.3. *Let $p > 3$, let $k \geq p+3$ and let $r = k-2 \equiv b \mod (p-1)$, with $b = 2$ or $p-1$. Suppose that $v(a_p) = 1$ and that $\bar{V}_{k,a_p}$, the reduction of a lattice in V_{k,a_p}, is a non-split extension of 1 by ω, up to a twist.*

(1) If $b = 2$, $r \not\equiv 2/3 \mod p$, *and*

$$u := \frac{2}{2-r}\left(\frac{a_p}{p} - \binom{r}{2}\frac{p}{a_p}\right) \text{ is a } p\text{-adic unit with } \overline{u} = \overline{\varepsilon}, \text{ for } \varepsilon \in \{\pm 1\},$$

and

(a) $\overline{\frac{a_p}{p}} = \varepsilon\overline{\frac{r}{2}}$, *then* $\bar{V}_{k,a_p}$ *is "peu ramifiée",*

(b) $\overline{\frac{a_p}{p}} = \varepsilon\overline{(1-r)}$, *and if in addition, when* $r \equiv 2 \mod p$, *either*

$\mathbb{Q}_p(a_p)$ *is an unramified extension of* $\mathbb{Q}_p$ *or* $u - \varepsilon$ *is a uniformizer of* $\mathbb{Q}_p(a_p)$,

then $\bar{V}_{k,a_p}$ *is "peu ramifiée" if and only if*

$$v(u - \varepsilon) < 1.$$

Moreover, as a_p *varies with* $v(u-\varepsilon) \geq 1$, *the reduction* $\bar{V}_{k,a_p}$ *varies through all "très ramifiée" extensions.*

(2) If $b = p - 1$, $p \nmid r - b$ *and* $\overline{\frac{a_p}{p}} = \pm\overline{(r+1)}$, *then* $\bar{V}_{k,a_p}$ *is "peu ramifiée".*

Remark 1.4. We have:

- Theorem 1.3 distinguishes between the "peu" and "très ramifiée" possibilities completely for primes $p \geq 5$, when $r \not\equiv 2$ or $2/3 \mod p$. The extra assumptions on $\mathbb{Q}_p(a_p)$ in part (1) (b), when $r \equiv 2 \mod p$, could probably be removed.
- As far as we are aware, part (1) (b) of the theorem provides, for a fixed prime p, the first explicit infinite family of crystalline representations with "très ramifiée" reduction.
- The inequalities for u that occur in part (1) (b) of the theorem are reminiscent of similar inequalities in the semistable (non-crystalline) case [BM02], separating out the "peu" and "très ramifiée" cases in terms of the $\mathcal{L}$-invariant.

The proof of Theorem 1.3 relies on the work of Colmez [Col10], where the Langlands correspondences are studied functorially. One difficulty that arises is that one cannot usually use the standard lattice above to study subtler properties of the reduction $\bar{V}_{k,a_p}$. Colmez's functors establish correspondences between all stable lattices on the 'Galois side' and certain stable lattice on the 'automorphic side'. Moreover, these functors are compatible with the process of taking reduction, again allowing us to work on the automorphic side. The key is to find a suitable $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{Q}_p)$-stable lattice lying in the image of Colmez's functor whose reduction admits a particular composition series, which makes it possible to recognize whether the corresponding mod p Galois representation is "peu" or "très ramifiée".

We now provide some more details about the proof, referring to the text for some notation. Let St be the mod p Steinberg representation of G and let 1 be the trivial mod p representation of G. The isomorphism classes of (non-split) extensions E_τ of 1 by St are parameterized by classes

$$[\tau] := (\tau(1+p) : \tau(p)) \in \mathbb{P}^1(\bar{\mathbb{F}}_p),$$

of (non-zero) maps $\tau \in \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathrm{cont}}(\mathbb{Q}_p^\times, \bar{\mathbb{F}}_p)$. For instance, if E_τ is the non-split extension of 1 by St given by $\pi(0,1,1)$, the cokernel of $T-1$ acting on compactly supported mod p functions on the tree X, then $[\tau] = (0:1) \in \mathbb{P}^1(\bar{\mathbb{F}}_p)$. Here $\pi(r,\lambda,\eta)$ is the basic mod p representation of G, defined using compact induction, for $0 \leq r \leq p-1$, $\lambda \in \bar{\mathbb{F}}_p$ and η a smooth mod p character of $\mathbb{Q}_p^\times$ (cf. Section 2.2).

Let Π_τ be the unique non-split extension of the principal series representation $\pi(p-3,1,\omega)$ by E_τ, for $\tau \neq 0$, defined in [Col10]. If V is Colmez's functor from the 'automorphic side' to the 'Galois side', then it is known that $V(\Pi_\tau \otimes \omega^m)$ is a non-split extension of ω^m by ω^{m+1}, for $m \in \mathbb{Z}$. Moreover, the extension $V(\Pi_\tau \otimes \omega^m)$ is known to be "peu ramifiée" if and only if $E_\tau \cong \pi(0,1,1)$, that is, $[\tau] = (0:1)$. Thus if one can construct a possibly non-standard complete stable lattice Θ' in $B(V_{k,a_p})$ with $\bar{\Theta}' \cong \Pi_\tau \otimes \omega^m$, in and of itself not easy to do, to check whether $V(\bar{\Theta}')$ is "peu ramifiée", one 'only' needs to compute $[\tau]$. To this end, there is a linear form $\mu : \mathrm{St} \otimes \omega^m \to \bar{\mathbb{F}}_p(\omega^m)$ which has the property that if $e \in (E_\tau \otimes \omega^m) \setminus (\mathrm{St} \otimes \omega^m)$, then

$$[\tau] = \left(\mu\left(\left(\begin{smallmatrix} 1+p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{smallmatrix}\right) \cdot e - e\right) : \mu\left(\left(\begin{smallmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{smallmatrix}\right) \cdot e - e\right)\right) \in \mathbb{P}^1(\bar{\mathbb{F}}_p).$$

For instance, when $b = 2$ and so $m = 1$, under the conditions of part (1) (b), the most difficult part of Theorem 1.3 to prove, if we take $\varepsilon = 1$ for simplicity, then we construct a non-standard lattice Θ' such that $\bar{\Theta}' \cong \Pi_\tau \otimes \omega$ and show that

- $v(u-\varepsilon) < 1 \implies [\tau] = (0:1) \in \mathbb{P}^1(\bar{\mathbb{F}}_p)$, and,
- $v(u-\varepsilon) \geq 1 \implies [\tau] = (\overline{3r-2} : y) \in \mathbb{P}^1(\bar{\mathbb{F}}_p)$, for some (all) $y \in \bar{\mathbb{F}}_p$,

proving this part of the theorem.

We now briefly turn to the second question alluded to above. If $\bar{V}_{k,a_p}^{ss}$ is the trivial representation up to a twist, then again by Ribet, there is a lattice inside V_{k,a_p} that reduces to a non-split extension of the trivial representation 1 by 1, up to the same twist. One may ask whether this reduction is unramified or ramified. In the context of Theorem 1.1, this question arises exactly when

(3) $b = p$, $r \geq 3p-2$, $p \mid r-b$ and $\lambda = \pm\bar{1}$, so

$$\overline{\frac{a_p}{p}} = \lambda \pm \overline{\sqrt{r/p}}.$$

This second question seems rather difficult to answer in general because of the large number of possible non-homothetic lattices involved. However, as an example, at the end of Section 7, we show that the reduction corresponding to the standard lattice is (after twisting) non-split and unramified (see Theorem 7.60 in Section 7.8).

We end this paper in Section 8 by giving some examples to illustrate Theorems 1.1 and 1.3. In particular, we compare our results with the local restrictions of some known reductions of global p-adic Galois representations attached to modular forms of level one and small weight computed in [Ser73]. We show that our results match and also provide some new local information about the reductions in these special cases.

2. Basics

In this section, we recall some notation and well-known facts. Further details can be found in [Bre03b] and [BG15].

2.1. **Hecke operator T.** Let $G = \mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{Q}_p)$, $K = \mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ be the standard maximal compact subgroup of G and $Z = \mathbb{Q}_p^\times$ be the center of G. Let R be a $\mathbb{Z}_p$-algebra and let $V = \mathrm{Sym}^r R^2 \otimes D^s$ be the usual symmetric power representation of KZ twisted by a power of the determinant character D, modeled on homogeneous polynomials of degree r in the variables X, Y over R. For $g \in G$, $v \in V$, let $[g, v] \in \mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G V$ be the function with support in KZg^{-1} given by

$$g' \mapsto \begin{cases} g'g \cdot v, & \text{if } g' \in KZg^{-1} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Any function in $\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G V$ is compactly supported mod KZ and is a finite linear combination of functions of the form $[g, v]$, for $g \in G$ and $v \in V$. The Hecke operator T is defined by its action on these elementary functions via

$$T([g, v(X,Y)]) = \sum_{\lambda \in \mathbb{F}_p} \left[g \left(\begin{smallmatrix} p & [\lambda] \\ 0 & 1 \end{smallmatrix}\right), v\left(X, -[\lambda]X + pY\right) \right] + \left[g \left(\begin{smallmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & p \end{smallmatrix}\right), v(pX, Y) \right], \tag{2.1}$$

where $[\lambda]$ denotes the Teichmüller representative of $\lambda \in \mathbb{F}_p$.

For $m = 0$, set $I_0 = \{0\}$, and for $m > 0$, let $I_m = \{[\lambda_0] + [\lambda_1]p + \cdots + [\lambda_{m-1}]p^{m-1} : \lambda_i \in \mathbb{F}_p\} \subset \mathbb{Z}_p$, where the square brackets denote Teichmüller representatives. For $m \geq 1$, there is a truncation map $[\quad]_{m-1} : I_m \to I_{m-1}$ given by taking the first $m-1$ terms in the p-adic expansion above; for $m = 1$, $[\quad]_{m-1}$ is the 0-map. Let $\alpha = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & p \end{smallmatrix}\right)$. For $m \geq 0$ and $\lambda \in I_m$, let

$$g_{m,\lambda}^0 = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} p^m & \lambda \\ 0 & 1 \end{smallmatrix}\right) \qquad \text{and} \qquad g_{m,\lambda}^1 = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ p\lambda & p^{m+1} \end{smallmatrix}\right),$$

noting that $g_{0,0}^0 = \mathrm{Id}$ is the identity matrix and $g_{0,0}^1 = \alpha$ in G. Recall the decomposition

$$G \quad = \coprod_{\substack{m \geq 0,\, \lambda \in I_m, \\ i \in \{0,1\}}} KZ(g_{m,\lambda}^i)^{-1}.$$

Thus a general element in $\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G V$ is a finite sum of functions of the form $[g, v]$, with $g = g_{m,\lambda}^0$ or $g_{m,\lambda}^1$, for some $\lambda \in I_m$ and $v \in V$. For a $\mathbb{Z}_p$-algebra R, let $v = \sum_{i=0}^r c_i X^{r-i} Y^i \in V = \mathrm{Sym}^r R^2 \otimes D^s$.

Expanding the formula (2.1) for the Hecke operator T one may write $T = T^+ + T^-$, with

$$\begin{aligned}
T^+([g^0_{n,\mu}, v]) &= \sum_{\lambda\in I_1} \left[g^0_{n+1,\mu+p^n\lambda}, \sum_{j=0}^{r} \left(p^j \sum_{i=j}^{r} c_i \binom{i}{j} (-\lambda)^{i-j} \right) X^{r-j}Y^j \right], \\
T^-([g^0_{n,\mu}, v]) &= \left[g^0_{n-1,[\mu]_{n-1}}, \sum_{j=0}^{r} \left(\sum_{i=j}^{r} p^{r-i} c_i \binom{i}{j} \left(\frac{\mu - [\mu]_{n-1}}{p^{n-1}} \right)^{i-j} \right) X^{r-j}Y^j \right] \quad (n > 0), \\
T^-([g^0_{n,\mu}, v]) &= [\alpha, \sum_{j=0}^{r} p^{r-j} c_j X^{r-j}Y^j] \quad (n = 0).
\end{aligned}$$

These explicit formulas for T^+ and T^- will be used to compute $(T - a_p)f$, for $f \in \mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^{G} \mathrm{Sym}^r \bar{\mathbb{Q}}_p^2$.

2.2. **The mod p Local Langlands Correspondence.** For $0 \leq r \leq p-1$, $\lambda \in \bar{\mathbb{F}}_p$ and $\eta : \mathbb{Q}_p^\times \to \bar{\mathbb{F}}_p^\times$ a smooth character, let

$$\pi(r, \lambda, \eta) \quad := \quad \frac{\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^{G} V_r}{T - \lambda} \otimes (\eta \circ \det)$$

be the smooth admissible representation of G, where ind_{KZ}^{G} is compact induction, and T is the Hecke operator. With this notation, Breuil's semisimple mod p Local Langlands Correspondence [Bre03b, Def. 1.1] is given by:

- $\lambda = 0$: $\quad \mathrm{ind}(\omega_2^{r+1}) \otimes \eta \overset{LL}{\longmapsto} \pi(r, 0, \eta)$,
- $\lambda \neq 0$: $\quad \left(\mu_\lambda \omega^{r+1} \oplus \mu_{\lambda^{-1}}\right) \otimes \eta \overset{LL}{\longmapsto} \pi(r, \lambda, \eta)^{ss} \oplus \pi([p-3-r], \lambda^{-1}, \eta\omega^{r+1})^{ss}$,

where $\{0, 1, \ldots, p-2\} \ni [p-3-r] \equiv p-3-r \mod (p-1)$.

Consider the locally algebraic representation of G given by

$$\Pi_{k,a_p} = \frac{\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^{G} \mathrm{Sym}^r \bar{\mathbb{Q}}_p^2}{T - a_p},$$

where $r = k - 2 \geq 0$ and T is the Hecke operator. Consider the standard lattice in Π_{k,a_p} given by

$$\Theta = \Theta_{k,a_p} := \mathrm{image}\left(\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^{G} \mathrm{Sym}^r \bar{\mathbb{Z}}_p^2 \to \Pi_{k,a_p}\right) \simeq \frac{\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^{G} \mathrm{Sym}^r \bar{\mathbb{Z}}_p^2}{(T - a_p)(\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^{G} \mathrm{Sym}^r \bar{\mathbb{Q}}_p^2) \cap \mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^{G} \mathrm{Sym}^r \bar{\mathbb{Z}}_p^2}. \tag{2.2}$$

It is known that the semisimplification of the reduction of this lattice satisfies $\bar{\Theta}_{k,a_p}^{\mathrm{ss}} \simeq LL(\bar{V}_{k,a_p}^{ss})$, where LL is the (semi-simple) mod p Local Langlands Correspondence above [Ber10]. Since the map LL is clearly injective, it is enough to know $LL(\bar{V}_{k,a_p}^{ss})$ to determine $\bar{V}_{k,a_p}^{ss}$.

2.3. **Useful lemmas.** We recall some combinatorial results from [BG15]. Lemma 2.4 is not stated there but we skip the proof here, since it is similar.

Lemma 2.1. *For $r \equiv a \mod (p-1)$, with $1 \leq a \leq p-1$, we have*

$$S_r := \sum_{\substack{0 < j < r, \\ j \equiv a \mod (p-1)}} \binom{r}{j} \equiv 0 \mod p.$$

Moreover, we have $\frac{1}{p} S_r \equiv \frac{a-r}{a} \mod p$, for $p > 2$.

Lemma 2.2. *Let* $2p \leq r \equiv a \mod (p-1)$*, with* $2 \leq a \leq p-1$*. Then one can choose integers* $\alpha_j \in \mathbb{Z}$*, for all* j*, with* $0 < j < r$ *and* $j \equiv a \mod (p-1)$*, such that the following properties hold:*

1. *For all* j *as above,* $\binom{r}{j} \equiv \alpha_j \mod p$*,*
2. $\sum\limits_{j \geq n} \binom{j}{n} \alpha_j \equiv 0 \mod p^{3-n}$*, for* $n = 0,\ 1$*,*
3. $\sum\limits_{j \geq 2} \binom{j}{2} \alpha_j \equiv \begin{cases} 0 \mod p, & \text{if } 3 \leq a \leq p-1 \\ \binom{r}{2} \mod p, & \text{if } a = 2. \end{cases}$

Lemma 2.3. *We have:*

- (i) *If* $r \equiv b \mod (p-1)$*, with* $2 \leq b \leq p$*, then*

$$T_r := \sum_{\substack{0 < j < r-1, \\ j \equiv b-1 \mod (p-1)}} \binom{r}{j} \equiv b - r \mod p.$$

- (ii) *If* $r \equiv b \mod p(p-1)$*, with* $3 \leq b \leq p$*, then one can choose integers* β_j*, for all* $j \equiv b-1 \mod (p-1)$*, with* $b-1 \leq j < r-1$*, satisfying the following properties:*
  1. $\beta_j \equiv \binom{r}{j} \mod p$*, for all* j *as above,*
  2. $\sum\limits_{j \geq n} \binom{j}{n} \beta_j \equiv 0 \mod p^{3-n}$*, for* $n = 0,\ 1,\ 2$*.*

Lemma 2.4. *Let* $p \geq 3$*,* $2p \leq r \equiv 1 \mod (p-1)$ *and let* p *divide* r*. Then one can choose integers* $\alpha_j \in \mathbb{Z}$*, for all* j *with* $1 < j < r$ *and* $j \equiv 1 \mod (p-1)$*, such that the following properties hold:*

1. *For all* j *as above,* $\binom{r}{j} \equiv \alpha_j \mod p$*,*
2. $\sum\limits_{j \geq n} \binom{j}{n} \alpha_j \equiv 0 \mod p^{3-n}$*, for* $n = 0, 1, 2$*.*

2.4. **Further useful results.**

We now state some identities involving sums of products of binomial coefficients, which will be useful in treating the delicate case $r \equiv 2 \mod (p-1)$.

Lemma 2.5. *Let* $p \geq 3$*. If* $s \equiv 1 \mod (p-1)$ *and* $t = v(s-1)$*, then* $p^i \binom{s}{i} \equiv 0 \mod p^{t+2}$*, for all* $i \geq 2$*.*

Lemma 2.6. *Let* $p > 3$*. If* $r \equiv 2 \mod (p-1)$ *and* $t = v(r-2)$*, then* $p^i \binom{r}{i} \equiv 0 \mod p^{t+3}$*, for all* $i \geq 3$*.*

Lemma 2.5 is [BG13, Lemma 2.1], and the proof of Lemma 2.6 is very similar, so is skipped here.

Lemma 2.7. *Let* $p > 2$*. If* $P(X) = 1 + pX \in \mathbb{Z}_p[X]$*, then* $P(X)^{p^t} \equiv 1 + p^{t+1}X \mod p^{t+2}$*, for all* $t \geq 0$*.*

Proof. We induct on t. The case $t = 0$ is clear. Write $P(X)^{p^t} = 1 + p^{t+1}X + p^{t+2}Q(X)$, for $Q(X) \in \mathbb{Z}_p[X]$. Then $P(X)^{p^{t+1}} = (1 + p^{t+1}X + p^{t+2}Q(X))^p = \sum_{i \geq 0} \binom{p}{i} p^{i(t+1)} (X + pQ(X))^i$. We have $v_p(\binom{p}{i} p^{i(t+1)}) \geq t+3$, for all $i \geq 2$. Indeed, for $i < p$, we have $v_p(\binom{p}{i} p^{i(t+1)}) = 1 + i(t+1) = ti + i + 1$, and for $i = p$, we have $v_p(\binom{p}{i} p^{i(t+1)}) = p(t+1) \geq t+3$, as $p \neq 2$. So $P(X)^{p^{t+1}} \equiv 1 + p^{t+2}X \mod p^{t+3}$. □

The first part of the following proposition generalizes Lemma 2.1 when $a = 2$ and $p > 3$.

Proposition 2.8. *Let $p > 3$ and write $r = 2 + n(p-1)p^t$, with $t \geq 0$ and $n \geq 0$. Then, the following identities hold:*

(1)

$$\sum_{\substack{0<j<r \\ j\equiv 2 \bmod (p-1)}} \binom{r}{j} \equiv \frac{p(2-r)}{2} \mod p^{t+2}.$$

(2)

$$\sum_{\substack{0<j<r \\ j\equiv 2 \bmod (p-1)}} j\binom{r}{j} \equiv \frac{pr(2-r)}{1-p} \mod p^{t+2}.$$

(3)

$$\sum_{\substack{0<j<r \\ j\equiv 2 \bmod (p-1)}} \binom{j}{2}\binom{r}{j} \equiv \frac{\binom{r}{2}}{1-p} \mod p^{t+1}.$$

(4) For all $i \geq 3$,

$$\sum_{\substack{0<j<r \\ j\equiv 2 \bmod (p-1)}} \binom{j}{i}\binom{r}{j} \equiv 0 \mod p^{t+3-i}.$$

Proof. Let $0 \leq i < r$. Let $S_{i,r} = \sum_{\substack{0<j<r \\ j\equiv 2 \bmod (p-1)}} \binom{j}{i}\binom{r}{j}$. Let $\Sigma_{i,r} = (p-1)\sum_{\substack{j\geq 0 \\ j\equiv 2 \bmod (p-1)}} \binom{j}{i}\binom{r}{j}$, so $\Sigma_{i,r} = (p-1)(S_{i,r} + \binom{r}{i})$. Let $f_r(x) = (1+x)^r = \sum_{i\geq 0}\binom{r}{i}x^i$, which we consider as a function $\mathbb{Z}_p \to \mathbb{Z}_p$. Let $g_{i,r}(x) = \frac{x^{i-2}}{i!}f_r^{(i)}(x)$, so that $g_{i,r}(x) = \binom{r}{i}x^{i-2}(1+x)^{r-i} = \sum_{\ell\geq 0}\binom{r}{\ell}\binom{\ell}{i}x^{\ell-2}$.

Let $\mu' = \mu_{p-1} \setminus \{-1\}$ be the $(p-1)$-st roots of unity sans -1. Then $\Sigma_{i,r} = \sum_{\xi\in\mu_{p-1}} g_{i,r}(\xi) = \sum_{\xi\in\mu'} g_{i,r}(\xi)$, as $r > i$. Let $U_{i,r} = \sum_{\xi\in\mu'}\xi^{i-2}(1+\xi)^{r-i}$. Then $\Sigma_{i,r} = \binom{r}{i}U_{i,r}$, so that finally $(p-1)(S_{i,r} + \binom{r}{i}) = \binom{r}{i}U_{i,r}$.

When $i \geq 3$, observe that $U_{i,r} \in \mathbb{Z}_p$, so part (4) of the proposition follows from Lemma 2.6.

When $i = 2$, we have $U_{2,r} = \sum_{\xi\in\mu'}(1+\xi)^{n(p-1)p^t}$. If $\xi \in \mu'$, then $1+\xi \in \mathbb{Z}_p^\times$, so $(1+\xi)^{p-1} = 1 + pz_\xi$, for some $z_\xi \in \mathbb{Z}_p$. By Lemma 2.7, $(1+pz_\xi)^{p^t} \equiv 1 \mod p^{t+1}$, so $(1+\xi)^{r-2} \equiv 1 \mod p^{t+1}$. So $U_{2,r} \equiv p-2 \mod p^{t+1}$ and $S_{2,r} \equiv \binom{r}{2}/(1-p) \mod p^{t+1}$, proving part (3).

When $i = 1$, write again $(1+\xi)^{p-1} = 1 + pz_\xi$. Then $(1+\xi)^{(p-1)p^t} \equiv 1 + p^{t+1}z_\xi \mod p^{t+2}$, by Lemma 2.7. So we get

$$U_{1,r} \equiv \sum_{\xi\in\mu'}\xi^{-1}(1+\xi) + np^{t+1}\sum_{\xi\in\mu'}\xi^{-1}(1+\xi)z_\xi \mod p^{t+2}.$$

By computing $U_{1,2}$ and $U_{1,p+1}$ we get that $\sum_{\xi\in\mu'}\xi^{-1}(1+\xi) = p-1$ and $\sum_{\xi\in\mu'}\xi^{-1}(1+\xi)z_\xi \equiv -1 \mod p$, which gives $U_{1,r} \equiv p - 1 - np^{t+1} \mod p^{t+2}$, so $S_{1,r} \equiv nrp^{t+1} \mod p^{t+2}$, proving part (2).

Let $S_r = S_{0,r}$ and $\Sigma_r = \Sigma_{0,r}$, so that $\Sigma_r = (p-1)(S_r+1)$. Note $\Sigma_r = \sum_{\xi\in\mu_{p-1}} f_r(\xi) = \sum_{\xi\in\mu'} f_r(\xi)$, as $r > 0$. We have $(1+\xi)^{2+n(p-1)p^t} \equiv (1+\xi)^2(1+np^{t+1}z_\xi) \mod p^{t+2}$, so that

$$\Sigma_r \equiv \sum_{\xi\in\mu'}(1+\xi)^2 + np^{t+1}\sum_{\xi\in\mu'}(1+\xi)^2 z_\xi \mod p^{t+2}.$$

Let $s = \sum_{\xi\in\mu'}(1+\xi)^2$ and let $s' = \sum_{\xi\in\mu'}(1+\xi)^2 z_\xi$. Then $s = \Sigma_2 = p-1$. On the other hand, $s + ps' \equiv \Sigma_{p+1} \mod p^2$. We also have that $\Sigma_{p+1} \equiv (p-1)(1+\binom{p+1}{p-1}) \equiv (p-1)(1+p/2) \mod p^2$. So $s' \equiv -1/2 \mod p$. Putting everything together, we get $\Sigma_r \equiv (p-1) - p^{t+1}n/2 \mod p^{t+2}$ and so $S_r \equiv p^{t+1}n/2 \mod p^{t+2}$, proving part (1) as well. □

We now state two more propositions of a similar nature.

Proposition 2.9. *Let $p > 3$ and write $s = 1 + n(p-1)p^t$, with $t \geq 0$ and $n \geq 0$. Then, we have:*

(1)

$$\sum_{j\equiv 1 \mod (p-1)} \binom{s}{j} \equiv 1 + np^{t+1} \mod p^{t+2}.$$

(2)

$$\sum_{j\equiv 1 \mod (p-1)} j\binom{s}{j} \equiv \frac{s(p-2)}{p-1} - snp^{t+1} \mod p^{t+2}.$$

(3) For all $i \geq 2$,

$$\sum_{j\equiv 1 \mod (p-1)} \binom{j}{i}\binom{s}{j} \equiv 0 \mod p^{t+2-i}.$$

Proposition 2.10. *Let $p > 3$ and write $r = 2 + n(p-1)p^t$, with $t \geq 0$ and $n \geq 0$. Then, we have:*

(1)

$$\sum_{\substack{1<j\leq r-1 \\ j\equiv 1 \mod (p-1)}} \binom{r}{j} \equiv 2 - r + 2p^{t+1}n \mod p^{t+2}.$$

(2)

$$\sum_{\substack{1<j\leq r-1 \\ j\equiv 1 \mod (p-1)}} j\binom{r}{j} \equiv nrp^{t+1} \mod p^{t+2}.$$

(3)

$$\sum_{\substack{1<j\leq r-1 \\ j\equiv 1 \mod (p-1)}} \binom{j}{2}\binom{r}{j} \equiv \frac{\binom{r}{2}}{p-1} \mod p^{t+1}.$$

(4) For all $i \geq 3$,

$$\sum_{\substack{1<j\leq r-1 \\ j\equiv 1 \mod (p-1)}} \binom{j}{i}\binom{r}{j} \equiv 0 \mod p^{t+3-i}.$$

We do not give the proofs of Proposition 2.9 and 2.10 as they are very similar to the proof of Proposition 2.8. The proof of Proposition 2.9 makes use of Lemma 2.5 instead of Lemma 2.6.

3. A QUOTIENT OF $V_r = \mathrm{Sym}^r \bar{\mathbb{F}}_p^2$

3.1. **Definition of P.** Let V_r denote the $(r+1)$-dimensional $\bar{\mathbb{F}}_p$-vector space of homogeneous polynomials in two variables X and Y of degree r over $\bar{\mathbb{F}}_p$. The group $\Gamma = \mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{F}_p)$ acts on V_r by the formula $\left(\begin{smallmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{smallmatrix}\right) \cdot F(X,Y) = F(aX+cY, bX+dY)$.

Let $X_r \subset V_r$ denote the $\bar{\mathbb{F}}_p[\Gamma]$-span of the monomial X^r. Let $\theta(X,Y) = X^pY - XY^p$. The action of Γ on θ is via the determinant. We define two important submodules of V_r as follows.

$$V_r^* := \{F \in V_r : \theta \mid F\} \cong \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } r < p+1 \\ V_{r-p-1} \otimes D, & \text{if } r \geq p+1, \end{cases}$$

$$V_r^{**} := \{F \in V_r : \theta^2 \mid F\} \cong \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } r < 2p+2 \\ V_{r-2p-2} \otimes D^2, & \text{if } r \geq 2p+2. \end{cases}$$

We set $X_r^* := X_r \cap V_r^*$ and $X_r^{**} = X_r \cap V_r^{**}$.

The mod p reduction $\overline{\Theta}_{k,a_p}$ of the lattice Θ_{k,a_p} is a quotient of $\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G V_r$, for $r = k-2$. By [BG09, Rem. 4.4] we know that if $v(a_p) = 1$ and $r \geq p$, then the map $\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G V_r \twoheadrightarrow \overline{\Theta}_{k,a_p}$ factors through $\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G P$, where

$$P := \frac{V_r}{X_r + V_r^{**}}.$$

We now study the Γ-module structure of the quotient P of V_r. In particular, we will show that P has 3 (and occasionally 2) Jordan-Hölder (JH) factors.

3.2. **A filtration on P.** In order to make use of results in Glover [Glo78], let us abuse notation a bit and model V_r on the space of homogeneous polynomials in two variables X and Y of degree r with coefficients in $\mathbb{F}_p$, Once we establish the structure of P over $\mathbb{F}_p$, it will immediately imply the corresponding result over $\bar{\mathbb{F}}_p$, by extension of scalars.

We work with the representatives $1 \leq a \leq p-1$ of the congruence classes of $r \mod (p-1)$. Note that $a = 1$ corresponds to $b = p$ from the Introduction, whereas the other values of a and b coincide.

Proposition 3.1. *Let $p \geq 3$, and $r \equiv a \mod (p-1)$, with $1 \leq a \leq p-1$.*

(i) For $r \geq p$, the Γ-module structure of V_r/V_r^* is given by

$$0 \to V_a \to \frac{V_r}{V_r^*} \to V_{p-a-1} \otimes D^a \to 0,$$

and the sequence splits if and only if $a = p-1$.

(ii) For $r \geq 2p+1$, the Γ-module structure of V_r^*/V_r^{**} is given by

$$0 \to V_{p-2} \otimes D \to \frac{V_r^*}{V_r^{**}} \to V_1 \to 0, \qquad \text{if } a = 1,$$

$$0 \to V_{p-1} \otimes D \to \frac{V_r^*}{V_r^{**}} \to V_0 \otimes D \to 0, \qquad \text{if } a = 2,$$

$$0 \to V_{a-2} \otimes D \to \frac{V_r^*}{V_r^{**}} \to V_{p-a+1} \otimes D^{a-1} \to 0, \qquad \text{if } 3 \leq a \leq p-1,$$

and the sequences above split if and only if $a = 2$.

Proof. See [BG15, Prop. 2.1, Prop. 2.2]. □

Lemma 3.2. *Let $p \geq 3$, $r \geq 2p$ and $r \equiv a \mod (p-1)$, with $1 \leq a \leq p-1$. Then*

$$X_r^*/X_r^{**} = \begin{cases} V_{p-2} \otimes D, & \text{if } a = 1 \text{ and } p \nmid r, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Proof. This follows from [BG15, Lem. 3.1, Lem. 4.7]. □

There is a filtration on V_r/V_r^{**} given by

$$0 \subset \frac{\langle \theta X^{r-p-1} \rangle + V_r^{**}}{V_r^{**}} \subset \frac{V_r^*}{V_r^{**}} \subset \frac{X_r + V_r^*}{V_r^{**}} \subset \frac{V_r}{V_r^{**}},$$

where the graded parts of this filtration are non-zero irreducible Γ-modules. Looking at the image of this filtration inside P, we get a filtration:

$$0 \subset W_0 := \frac{\langle \theta X^{r-p-1} \rangle + X_r + V_r^{**}}{V_r^{**} + X_r} \subset W_1 := \frac{V_r^* + X_r}{V_r^{**} + X_r} \subset W_2 := \frac{V_r}{V_r^{**} + X_r} = P.$$

Each of the graded pieces of this filtration is either irreducible or zero. We set $J_i := W_i/W_{i-1}$, for $i = 0, 1, 2$, with $W_{-1} = 0$. Note that $W_1 \cong \dfrac{V_r^*/V_r^{**}}{X_r^*/X_r^{**}}$ is never zero by Proposition 3.1 (ii) and Lemma 3.2. In fact, W_1 has two JH factors J_0 and J_1 unless $a = 1$ and $p \nmid r$, in which case $W_0 = J_0 = 0$ and $W_1 = J_1$ is irreducible. Also, $J_2 \cong \dfrac{V_r}{V_r^* + X_r} \cong \dfrac{V_r/V_r^*}{X_r/X_r^*}$ is a proper quotient of V_r/V_r^*. Using Proposition 3.1, and [Glo78, (4.5)], we obtain:

Proposition 3.3. *Let $p \geq 3$, $r \geq 2p$ and $r \equiv a \mod (p-1)$, with $1 \leq a \leq p-1$. Then the structure of P is given by the following short exact sequences of Γ-modules:*

(i) If $a = 1$ and $p \nmid r$, then

$$0 \to V_1 \to P \to V_{p-2} \otimes D \to 0,$$

that is, $J_0 = 0$, $J_1 = V_1$ and $J_2 = V_{p-2} \otimes D$.

(ii) If $a = 1$ and $p \mid r$, or if $2 \leq a \leq p-1$, then

$$0 \to W_1 \cong V_r^*/V_r^{**} \to P \to V_{p-a-1} \otimes D^a \to 0,$$

that is,

(a) $J_0 = V_{p-2} \otimes D$, $J_1 = V_1$ *and* $J_2 = V_{p-2} \otimes D$ *if* $a = 1$ *and* $p \mid r$,

(b) $J_0 = V_{p-1} \otimes D$, $J_1 = V_0 \otimes D$ *and* $J_2 = V_{p-3} \otimes D^2$ *if* $a = 2$, $r > 2p$ ($J_1 = 0$ *if* $r = 2p$),

(c) $J_0 = V_{a-2} \otimes D$, $J_1 = V_{p-a+1} \otimes D^{a-1}$ *and* $J_2 = V_{p-1-a} \otimes D^a$ *if* $3 \leq a \leq p-1$.

The next lemma will be used many times below and describes some explicit properties of the maps $W_i \twoheadrightarrow J_i$, for $i = 0, 1, 2$.

Lemma 3.4. *Let* $p \geq 3$, $r \geq 2p$, $r \equiv a \mod (p-1)$, *with* $1 \leq a \leq p-1$.

If $3 \leq a \leq p-1$, *then:*

(i) The image of θX^{r-p-1} *in* W_0 *maps to* $X^{a-2} \in J_0$.

(ii) The image of $\theta X^{r-p-a+1} Y^{a-2}$ *in* W_1 *maps to* $X^{p-a+1} \in J_1$.

(iii) The image of $X^{r-i}Y^i$ *in* W_2 *maps to* $0 \in J_2$, *for* $0 \leq i \leq a-1$, *whereas the image of* $X^{r-a}Y^a$ *in* W_2 *maps to* X^{p-a-1} *in* J_2.

If $a = 2$, *then:*

(i) The image of θX^{r-p-1} *in* W_0 *maps to* $X^{p-1} \in J_0$.

(ii) For $r > 2p$, *the image of* $\theta X^{r-2p} Y^{p-1}$ *in* W_1 *maps to* $1 \in J_1$.

(iii) The image of $X^{r-i}Y^i$ *in* W_2 *maps to* $0 \in J_2$, *for* $i = 0, 1$, *whereas the image of* $X^{r-2}Y^2$ *in* W_2 *maps to* $X^{p-3} \in J_2$.

If $a = 1$, *then:*

(i) If $p \mid r$, *the image of* θX^{r-p-1} *in* W_0 *maps to* $X^{p-2} \in J_0$.

(ii) The image of $\theta X^{r-2p+1} Y^{p-2}$ *in* W_1 *maps to* $X \in J_1$.

(iii) The image of $X^{r-1}Y$ *in* W_2 *maps to* $X^{p-2} \in J_2$.

Proof. The proof is elementary and consists of explicit calculation with the maps given in [Glo78, (4.2)] and [Bre03b, Lem. 5.3]. □

Let U_i denote the image of $\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G W_i$ under the map $\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G P \twoheadrightarrow \bar{\Theta} = \bar{\Theta}_{k,a_p}$, and let $F_i := U_i/U_{i-1}$, for $i = 0, 1, 2$, with $U_{-1} := 0$. Then we have the following commutative diagrams of G-modules:

(3.1)
$$\begin{tikzcd}
0 \arrow[r] & \mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G W_1 \arrow[r] \arrow[d, two heads] & \mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G P \arrow[r] \arrow[d, two heads] & \mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G J_2 \arrow[r] \arrow[d, two heads] & 0 \\
0 \arrow[r] & U_1 \arrow[r] & \bar{\Theta}\ (= U_2) \arrow[r] & F_2 \arrow[r] & 0,
\end{tikzcd}$$

(3.2)
$$\begin{tikzcd}
0 \arrow[r] & \mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G J_0 \arrow[r] \arrow[d, two heads] & \mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G W_1 \arrow[r] \arrow[d, two heads] & \mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G J_1 \arrow[r] \arrow[d, two heads] & 0 \\
0 \arrow[r] & F_0\ (= U_0) \arrow[r] & U_1 \arrow[r] & F_1 \arrow[r] & 0.
\end{tikzcd}$$

The semisimplification of $\bar{\Theta}$ is completely determined by the G-modules F_0, F_1 and F_2.

4. THE CASE $3 \leq a \leq p-1$

Let $r > 2p$ and $r \equiv a \mod (p-1)$, with $3 \leq a \leq p-1$. If $p \nmid r-a$ and $v(a_p) = 1$, then $u := \frac{a}{a-r} \cdot \frac{a_p}{p}$ is a p-adic unit. In this section we will give a proof of the following result.

Theorem 4.1. *Let $2p < k-2 = r \equiv a \mod (p-1)$, with $3 \leq a \leq p-1$, and assume that $v(a_p) = 1$.*

(i) If $p \nmid r-a$, then $\bar{V}_{k,a_p}^{ss} \cong \mu_\lambda \cdot \omega^a \oplus \mu_{\lambda^{-1}} \cdot \omega$ is reducible, with $\lambda = \bar{u} \in \mathbb{F}_p^\times$.

(ii) If $p \mid r-a$, then $\bar{V}_{k,a_p} \cong \mathrm{ind}(\omega_2^{a+1})$ is irreducible.

Let us begin with the following elementary lemma.

Lemma 4.2. *Let $r \equiv a \mod (p-1)$, with $3 \leq a \leq p-1$. Then we have the congruence*

$$X^{r-1}Y \equiv \frac{a-r}{a} \cdot \theta X^{r-p-1} \mod X_r + V_r^{**}.$$

Hence, if $p \mid r-a$, then $X^{r-1}Y \in X_r + V_r^{**}$.

Proof. One checks that the following congruence holds:

$$aX^{r-1}Y + \sum_{k \in \mathbb{F}_p} k^{p-a}(kX+Y)^r \equiv (a-r) \cdot \theta X^{r-p-1} + F(X,Y) \mod p,$$

with $F(X,Y) := (a-r) \cdot X^{r-p}Y^p - \sum\limits_{\substack{1<j\leq r \\ j \equiv 1 \mod (p-1)}} \binom{r}{j} \cdot X^{r-j}Y^j \in V_r^{**}$, by [BG15, Lem 2.3]. □

We use the notation from Section 3.2 and the Diagrams (3.1) and (3.2). We have $J_0 = V_{a-2} \otimes D$, $J_1 = V_{p-a+1} \otimes D^{a-1}$, $J_2 = V_{p-a-1} \otimes D^a$, by Proposition 3.3. Recall that F_i denotes the factor of $\bar{\Theta}$ which is a quotient of $\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G J_i$, for $i = 0, 1, 2$.

Proposition 4.3. *Let $2p < r \equiv a \mod (p-1)$, with $3 \leq a \leq p-1$, and suppose that $v(a_p) = 1$.*

(i) If $p \nmid r-a$, then $F_1 = 0$ and $\bar{\Theta}$ fits in the short exact sequence

$$0 \to F_0 = U_1 \to \bar{\Theta} \to F_2 \to 0.$$

(ii) If $p \mid r-a$, then $U_1 = 0$, and $\bar{\Theta} \cong F_2$ is a quotient of $\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G J_2$.

Proof. Let us consider

$$f_0 := \left[\mathrm{Id}, \frac{X^{r-a-p+2}Y^{a+p-2} - X^{r-a+1}Y^{a-1}}{a_p}\right] \in \mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G \mathrm{Sym}^r \bar{\mathbb{Q}}_p^2.$$

As $r > 2p$, $T^- f_0$ is integral and dies mod p. Also $T^+ f_0 \in \mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G \langle X^{r-1}Y \rangle + p \cdot \mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G \mathrm{Sym}^r \bar{\mathbb{Z}}_p^2$ is integral.

(i) If $p \nmid r-a$, then $T^+ f_0 \equiv -\frac{p}{a_p} \cdot \sum\limits_{\lambda \in \mathbb{F}_p} \left[g_{1,[\lambda]}^0, (-[\lambda])^{a-2} X^{r-1}Y\right] \mod p$. By Lemma 4.2, this is the same as $-\frac{p}{a_p} \cdot \sum\limits_{\lambda \in \mathbb{F}_p} \left[g_{1,[\lambda]}^0, (-[\lambda])^{a-2} \frac{(a-r)}{a} \cdot \theta X^{r-p-1}\right]$ in $\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G P$. Hence $(T - a_p) f_0$ maps to

$$T^+ f_0 - a_p f_0 \equiv -\frac{p}{a_p} \cdot \sum_{\lambda \in \mathbb{F}_p} \left[g_{1,[\lambda]}^0, (-[\lambda])^{a-2} \frac{(a-r)}{a} \cdot \theta X^{r-p-1}\right] + \left[\mathrm{Id}, \theta X^{r-p-a+1}Y^{a-2}\right] \in \mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G P.$$

Note that θX^{r-p-1} maps to $0 \in J_1 = W_1/W_0$. By Lemma 3.4 (ii), the polynomial $\theta X^{r-p-a+1}Y^{a-2}$ maps to $X^{p-a+1} \neq 0$ in J_1. We conclude that $(T-a_p)f_0$ maps to $\left[\mathrm{Id}, X^{p-a+1}\right] \in \mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^{G} J_1$, which generates it as a G-module. Hence $F_1 = 0$ and the result follows.

(ii) If $p \mid r-a$, then by Lemma 4.2, we know that $X^{r-1}Y$ maps to $0 \in P$. Thus $T^{+}f_0$ dies in $\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^{G} P$. Hence $(T-a_p)f_0$ is integral and maps to the image of $-a_p f_0 = [\mathrm{Id}, \theta X^{r-p-a+1}Y^{a-2}]$ in $\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^{G} P$. By Proposition 3.1 (ii), $W_1 \cong V_r^{*}/V_r^{**}$ is a non-split extension of the weight J_1 by J_0. By Lemma 3.4 (ii), the polynomial $\theta X^{r-p-a+1}Y^{a-2}$ maps to $X^{p-a+1} \neq 0$ in J_1 and hence generates W_1 as a Γ-module, so $[\mathrm{Id}, \theta X^{r-p-a+1}Y^{a-2}]$ generates $\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^{G} W_1$ as a G-module. This proves that the surjection $\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^{G} W_1 \twoheadrightarrow U_1$ is the zero map. $\square$

Proposition 4.4. *Let $2p < r \equiv a \mod (p-1)$, with $3 \leq a \leq p-1$. Assume that $p \nmid r-a$ and $v(a_p) = 1$, so that $u := \frac{a}{a-r} \cdot \frac{a_p}{p}$ is a p-adic unit. Then*

- *(i) F_0 is a quotient of $\pi(a-2, \bar{u}, \omega)$,*
- *(ii) F_2 is a quotient of $\pi(p-a-1, \bar{u}^{-1}, \omega^{a})$.*

Proof. (i) Consider $f_0 \in \mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^{G} \mathrm{Sym}^r \bar{\mathbb{Q}}_p^2$ given by

$$f_0 = \left[\mathrm{Id}, \frac{X^{r-1}Y - X^{r-p}Y^{p}}{p}\right] = \left[\mathrm{Id}, \frac{\theta X^{r-p-1}}{p}\right].$$

Since $r \geq p+2$, $T^{-}f_0 \equiv 0 \mod p$. By the formula for the Hecke operator,

$$(T-a_p)f_0 \equiv T^{+}f_0 - a_p f_0 \equiv \sum_{\lambda \in \mathbb{F}_p} \left[g_{1,[\lambda]}^{0}, X^{r-1}Y\right] - \overline{(a_p/p)} \left[\mathrm{Id}, \theta X^{r-p-1}\right] \mod p.$$

By Lemma 4.2, $(T-a_p)f_0$ maps to $\overline{\frac{(a-r)}{a}} \cdot \sum_{\lambda \in \mathbb{F}_p} \left[g_{1,[\lambda]}^{0}, \theta X^{r-p-1}\right] - \overline{(a_p/p)} \left[\mathrm{Id}, \theta X^{r-p-1}\right] \in \mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^{G} P$, which in fact lies in the submodule $\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^{G} W_0$. This maps to $\overline{\frac{(a-r)}{a}} \cdot (T - \bar{u}) \left[\mathrm{Id}, X^{a-2}\right] \in \mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^{G} J_0$, by Lemma 3.4 (i). The element $\left[\mathrm{Id}, X^{a-2}\right]$ generates $\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^{G} J_0$ as a G-module, so the map $\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^{G} J_0 \twoheadrightarrow F_0$ must factor through $\pi(a-2, \bar{u}, \omega)$.

(ii) Let us consider $f = f_0 + f_1 + f_2 \in \mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^{G} \mathrm{Sym}^r \bar{\mathbb{Q}}_p^2$, where

$$\begin{aligned} f_2 &= \sum_{\lambda \in \mathbb{F}_p} \left[g_{2,p[\lambda]}^{0}, \frac{1}{p} \cdot \left(Y^{r} - X^{p-1}Y^{r-p+1}\right)\right], \\ f_1 &= \left[g_{1,0}^{0}, \frac{(p-1)}{pa_p} \sum_{\substack{0<j<r \\ j \equiv a \mod (p-1)}} \alpha_j \cdot X^{r-j}Y^{j}\right], \\ f_0 &= \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } 3 \leq a < p-1, \\ \left[\mathrm{Id}, \frac{(1-p)}{p} \cdot \left(X^{r} - X^{r-p+1}Y^{p-1}\right)\right], & \text{if } a = p-1, \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

where the α_j are integers from Lemma 2.2. We compute that $T^{+}f_2 \in \mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^{G} \langle X^{r-1}Y \rangle + p \cdot \mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^{G} \mathrm{Sym}^r \bar{\mathbb{Z}}_p^2$, which maps to $0 \in \mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^{G} J_2$, by Lemma 3.4 (iii). By Lemma 2.2 and as $p \geq 5$, both T^+f_1 and T^-f_1 die mod p. We have

$$-a_pf_2 \equiv \sum_{\lambda\in\mathbb{F}_p}\left[g^0_{2,p[\lambda]}, \frac{a_p}{p}\cdot X^{p-1}Y^{r-p+1}\right] \mod X_r.$$

Using that $X^{p-1}Y^{r-p+1} \equiv X^{r-a}Y^a \mod V_r^*$, and Lemma 3.4 (iii), we get that $-a_pf_2$ maps to $\frac{a_p}{p}\cdot\sum_{\lambda\in\mathbb{F}_p}\left[g^0_{2,p[\lambda]}, X^{p-a-1}\right] \in \operatorname{ind}^G_{KZ}J_2$. Moreover, $T^+f_0 - a_pf_1 + T^-f_2$ is integral and congruent to

$$\left[g^0_{1,0}, \sum_{\substack{0<j<r\\ j\equiv a \mod (p-1)}} \frac{p-1}{p}\left(\binom{r}{j}-\alpha_j\right)\cdot X^{r-j}Y^j + Y^r\right] \mod p,$$

unless $a = p-1$, in which case we also have the terms $\sum_{\lambda\in\mathbb{F}_p}\left[g^0_{1,[\lambda]}, (-[\lambda])^{p-2}\cdot X^{r-1}Y\right]$ from T^+f_0, in addition to the above. In any case, $T^+f_0 - a_pf_1 + T^-f_2$ maps to $\left[g^0_{1,0}, \dfrac{r-a}{a}\cdot X^{p-a-1}\right] \in \operatorname{ind}^G_{KZ}J_2$, by Lemma 2.2, Lemma 2.1 and Lemma 3.4 (iii). If $a = p-1$, then T^-f_0 dies mod p and $-a_pf_0 \equiv \left[\mathrm{Id}, \frac{a_p}{p}\cdot X^{r-p+1}Y^{p-1}\right] \mod X_r$ maps to $\frac{a_p}{p}\cdot[\mathrm{Id}, 1]$ in $\operatorname{ind}^G_{KZ}J_2 = \operatorname{ind}^G_{KZ}V_0$.

So $(T-a_p)f$ is always integral and maps to $\frac{a_p}{p}\left(T - \frac{p}{a_p}\cdot\frac{(a-r)}{a}\right)[g^0_{1,0}, X^{p-a-1}]$ in $\operatorname{ind}^G_{KZ}J_2$. Therefore F_2 is a quotient of $\pi(p-a-1, \bar{u}^{-1}, \omega^a)$, as desired. □

Proof of Theorem 4.1. We have

(i) If $p \nmid r-a$, Proposition 4.3 (i) tells us that $\bar{\Theta}^{ss} \cong (F_0 \oplus F_2)^{ss}$. By Proposition 4.4, we have surjections $\pi(a-2, \bar{u}, \omega) \twoheadrightarrow F_0$, and $\pi(p-a-1, \bar{u}^{-1}, \omega^a) \twoheadrightarrow F_2$. Using the fact that $\bar{\Theta}$ lies in the image of the mod p Local Langlands Correspondence, we deduce that $\bar{\Theta}^{ss} \cong \pi(a-2, \bar{u}, \omega)^{ss} \oplus \pi(p-a-1, \bar{u}^{-1}, \omega^a)^{ss}$.

(ii) If $p \mid r-a$, then Proposition 4.3 (ii) and [BG09, Prop. 3.3] together imply that $\bar{V}_{k,a_p} \cong \operatorname{ind}(\omega_2^{a+1})$ is irreducible.

□

5. The case $a = 1$

We now treat the case $r \equiv 1 \mod (p-1)$ separately since the computations are more complicated.

Theorem 5.1. *Let $p \geq 5$, $r \geq 2p$ and $r \equiv 1 \mod (p-1)$. Assume that $v(a_p) = 1$.*

(i) If $p \nmid r$, then $\bar{V}_{k,a_p} \cong \operatorname{ind}(\omega_2^2)$.

(ii) If $p \mid r$, then $\bar{V}^{ss}_{k,a_p} \cong \mu_\lambda\cdot\omega \oplus \mu_{\lambda^{-1}}\cdot\omega$, where $\lambda^2 - c\lambda + 1 = 0$ with $c = \overline{\dfrac{a_p}{p} - \dfrac{r-p}{a_p}} \in \bar{\mathbb{F}}_p$.

Recall that by Proposition 3.3, we have $J_2 = V_{p-2}\otimes D$, $J_1 = V_1$, and $J_0 = \begin{cases} V_{p-2}\otimes D, & \text{if } p \mid r,\\ 0, & \text{if } p\nmid r.\end{cases}$

Proposition 5.2. *If $p \geq 3$, $r > 2p$ and $r \equiv 1 \mod (p-1)$, then $F_2 = 0$. As a consequence,*

(i) If $p \nmid r$, then $\bar{\Theta} \cong F_1$ is a quotient of $\operatorname{ind}^G_{KZ}J_1$.

(ii) If $p \mid r$, then $\bar{\Theta} \cong U_1$, and the bottom row of Diagram (3.2) *reduces to*

$$0 \to F_0 \to \bar{\Theta} \to F_1 \to 0.$$

Proof. Consider the function $f = f_0 \in \mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^{G} \mathrm{Sym}^r \bar{\mathbb{Q}}_p^2$ given by

$$f_0 = \left[\mathrm{Id}, \frac{XY^{r-1} - 2X^pY^{r-p} + X^{2p-1}Y^{r-2p+1}}{p}\right].$$

One checks that T^+f_0, T^-f_0, a_pf_0 are all integral, and that $T^+f_0 \equiv 0 \mod p$, $a_pf_0 \in \mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^{G} V_r^*$ and $T^-f_0 \equiv [\alpha, XY^{r-1}] \mod p$. By Lemma 3.4 (iii) and by Γ-linearity, $XY^{r-1} = \left(\begin{smallmatrix}0&1\\1&0\end{smallmatrix}\right) \cdot X^{r-1}Y$ maps to $-Y^{p-2}$, under the map $W_2 \twoheadrightarrow J_2$. So $(T - a_p)f$ maps to $[\alpha, -Y^{p-2}] \in \mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^{G} J_2$. As $[\alpha, -Y^{p-2}]$ generates $\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^{G} J_2$ as a G-module, we have $F_2 = 0$. □

Proposition 5.3. *Let $p \geq 3$, $r > 2p$, $r \equiv 1 \mod (p-1)$ and $p \mid r$. Then we have*

(i) $F_1 = 0$, and

(ii) F_0 is a quotient of $\dfrac{\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^{G}(V_{p-2} \otimes D)}{T^2 - cT + 1}$, where $c = \overline{\dfrac{a_p}{p} - \dfrac{r-p}{a_p}} \in \bar{\mathbb{F}}_p$.

Proof. (i) Consider the function $f = f_2 + f_1 + f_0 \in \mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^{G} \mathrm{Sym}^r \bar{\mathbb{Q}}_p^2$ given by

$$\begin{aligned}
f_2 &= \sum_{\lambda \in \mathbb{F}_p^*} \left[g_{2,p[\lambda]}^0, \frac{[\lambda]^{p-2}}{a_p} \cdot (Y^r - X^{r-p}Y^p)\right] + \left[g_{2,0}^0, \frac{1-p}{a_p} \cdot (XY^{r-1} - X^{r-p+1}Y^{p-1})\right], \\
f_1 &= \left[g_{1,0}^0, \frac{X^pY^{r-p} - XY^{r-1}}{p} + \frac{p-1}{a_p^2} \cdot \sum_{\substack{0<j<r-1 \\ j \equiv 0 \mod (p-1)}} \beta_j X^{r-j}Y^j\right], \\
f_0 &= \left[\mathrm{Id}, \frac{1-p}{a_p} \cdot (X^r - X^pY^{r-p})\right],
\end{aligned}$$

where β_j are the integers from Lemma 2.3 (ii). Using the facts that $p \mid r - p$ and $p \geq 3$, we see that T^+f_2 and T^-f_0 die mod p. We compute that

$$T^-f_1 - a_pf_0 \equiv [\mathrm{Id}, -XY^{r-1} - (X^r - X^pY^{r-p})] \mod p \equiv [\mathrm{Id}, \theta Y^{r-p-1}] \mod X_r. \tag{5.1}$$

Note that $T^+f_0 + T^-f_2 - a_pf_1$ is congruent mod p to

$$\left[g_{1,0}^0, \sum_{\substack{0<j<r-1 \\ j \equiv 0 \mod (p-1)}} \frac{p-1}{a_p}\left(\binom{r}{j} - \beta_j\right) \cdot X^{r-j}Y^j + \frac{p-1}{a_p}(r-p) \cdot XY^{r-1} - \frac{a_p}{p} \cdot \theta Y^{r-p-1}\right],$$

which is integral because $v(a_p) = 1$, $p \mid r - p$ and each $\beta_j \equiv \binom{r}{j} \mod p$. Rearranging the terms, we can write

$$T^+f_0 + T^-f_2 - a_pf_1 \equiv \left[g_{1,0}^0, (p-1)\left(F(X,Y) + \frac{p-r}{a_p} \cdot \theta Y^{r-p-1}\right) - \frac{a_p}{p} \cdot \theta Y^{r-p-1}\right],$$

where $F(X,Y) := \sum\limits_{\substack{0<j<r-1 \\ j\equiv 0 \mod (p-1)}} \frac{1}{a_p}\cdot\left(\binom{r}{j}-\beta_j\right)\cdot X^{r-j}Y^j - \frac{p-r}{a_p}\cdot X^pY^{r-p} \in V_r^{**}$, as it satisfies the criteria given in [BG15, Lem. 2.3]. Thus inside $\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G P$, we have

$$T^+f_0 + T^-f_2 - a_pf_1 \equiv \left[g_{1,0}^0,\ \left(-\frac{p-r}{a_p}-\frac{a_p}{p}\right)\cdot\theta Y^{r-p-1}\right]. \tag{5.2}$$

Then we compute that $T^+f_1 - a_pf_2$ is congruent to

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{\lambda\in\mathbb{F}_p}\left[g_{2,p[\lambda]}^0,\ (-[\lambda])^{r-p-1}(-p+1)\cdot X^{r-1}Y\right] \quad &- \sum_{\lambda\in\mathbb{F}_p^*}\left[g_{2,p[\lambda]}^0,\ (-[\lambda])^{p-2}(-p+1)\cdot(Y^r-X^{r-p}Y^p)\right] \\ &- [g_{2,0}^0, XY^{r-1}-X^{r-p+1}Y^{p-1}] \mod p.\end{aligned}$$

Going modulo X_r and V_r^{**}, we get

$$T^+f_1 - a_pf_2 \equiv \sum_{\lambda\in\mathbb{F}_p^*}\left[g_{2,p[\lambda]}^0,\ (-[\lambda])^{p-2}\theta X^{r-p-1}\right] + \left[g_{2,0}^0,\ \theta Y^{r-p-1} + \frac{(r-2p+1)}{p-1}\cdot\theta X^{r-2p+1}Y^{p-2}\right]. \tag{5.3}$$

We know $\theta X^{r-p-1}, \theta Y^{r-p-1}$ map to $0 \in J_1 = W_1/W_0$ and $\theta X^{r-2p+1}Y^{p-2}$ maps to $X \in J_1 = V_1$, by Lemma 3.4 (ii). By the equations (5.1), (5.2) and (5.3) above, $(T-a_p)f$ is integral and its image in $\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G P$ lies in $\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G W_1$ and maps to $[g_{2,0}^0, -X] \in \mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G J_1$, which generates $\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G J_1$ over G. Hence $F_1 = 0$.

(ii) Consider the function $f = f_2 + f_1 + f_0 \in \mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G \mathrm{Sym}^r\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_p^2$ given by

$$\begin{aligned} f_2 &= \sum_{\lambda,\mu\in\mathbb{F}_p}\left[g_{2,p[\mu]+[\lambda]}^0,\ \frac{Y^r-X^{r-p}Y^p}{a_p}\right], \\ f_1 &= \sum_{\lambda\in\mathbb{F}_p}\left[g_{1,[\lambda]}^0,\ -\frac{1}{p}\cdot(X^{r-1}Y-X^{r-p}Y^p) + \frac{p-1}{a_p^2}\cdot\sum_{\substack{1<j<r \\ j\equiv 1 \mod (p-1)}}\alpha_jX^{r-j}Y^j\right], \\ f_0 &= \left[\mathrm{Id},\ \frac{1-p}{a_p}\cdot(X^{r-1}Y-X^{r-p}Y^p)\right], \end{aligned}$$

where the α_j are the integers from Lemma 2.4. We check that T^+f_2 and T^-f_0 die mod p, since $p \mid r-p$ and $r \geq 2p$. Next we compute that modulo p and X_r, $T^+f_0 - a_pf_1 + T^-f_2$ is congruent to

$$\sum_{\lambda\in\mathbb{F}_p}\left[g_{1,[\lambda]}^0,\ \frac{(p-1)(r-p)}{a_p}X^{r-1}Y + \sum_{\substack{1<j<r \\ j\equiv 1 \mod (p-1)}}\frac{p-1}{a_p}\left(\binom{r}{j}-\alpha_j\right)\cdot X^{r-j}Y^j + \frac{a_p}{p}\cdot\theta X^{r-p-1}\right].$$

Rearranging the terms, we get

$$T^+f_0 - a_pf_1 + T^-f_2 \equiv \sum_{\lambda\in\mathbb{F}_p}\left[g_{1,[\lambda]}^0,\ \left(\frac{a_p}{p}-\frac{r-p}{a_p}\right)\theta X^{r-p-1} - F(X,Y)\right],$$

where

$$F(X,Y)=\frac{r-p}{a_p}\cdot X^{r-p}Y^p+\sum_{\substack{1<j<r\\ j\equiv 1 \mod (p-1)}}\frac{1}{a_p}\left(\binom{r}{j}-\alpha_j\right)\cdot X^{r-j}Y^j$$

can be checked to be in V_r^{**}, using [BG15, Lem. 2.3]. Thus in $\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G P$, we have

$$T^+f_0-a_pf_1+T^-f_2\equiv\sum_{\lambda\in\mathbb{F}_p}\left[g^0_{1,[\lambda]},\ \left(\frac{a_p}{p}-\frac{r-p}{a_p}\right)\theta X^{r-p-1}\right]. \tag{5.4}$$

We check that $T^+f_1-a_pf_2\equiv\sum\limits_{\mu,\lambda\in\mathbb{F}_p}\left[g^0_{2,p[\mu]+[\lambda]},\ -X^{r-1}Y-(Y^r-Y^pX^{r-p})\right] \mod p$, so

$$T^+f_1-a_pf_2\equiv\sum_{\mu,\lambda\in\mathbb{F}_p}\left[g^0_{2,p[\mu]+[\lambda]},\ -\theta X^{r-p-1}\right] \mod X_r. \tag{5.5}$$

Finally, we compute

$$T^-f_1-a_pf_0\equiv -a_pf_0\equiv\left[\mathrm{Id},-\theta X^{r-p-1}\right] \mod p. \tag{5.6}$$

By Lemma 3.4, the image of θX^{r-p-1} (in P) lands in W_0 and maps to $X^{p-2}\in J_0$. Using the formula for the T operator, and the equations (5.4), (5.5), (5.6), we obtain that $(T-a_p)f$ is integral, and in fact it is the image of $-(T^2-cT+1)[\mathrm{Id},X^{p-2}]\in \mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G J_0$, where $c=\overline{\frac{a_p}{p}-\frac{r-p}{a_p}}\in\bar{\mathbb{F}}_p$.

□

Proof of Theorem 5.1. Part (i) follows from Proposition 5.2 (i) and [BG09, Prop. 3.3], at least if $p>3$. If $p\mid r$, then $\bar{\Theta}$ is a quotient of $\dfrac{\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G V_{p-2}\otimes D}{T^2-cT+1}$, by Propositions 5.2 (ii) and 5.3. Now part (ii) follows by the mod p semisimple Local Langlands Correspondence. □

6. The case $a=2$

This section deals with the remaining case $r\equiv 2 \mod (p-1)$, for $r\geq 2p$ and $p>3$. This case is special in the sense that there are further complications with the computation. We shall show that the reduction $\bar{V}_{k,a_p}^{ss}$ depends on the size of the valuation of the quantity

$$a_p^2-\binom{r}{2}p^2,$$

which is at least 2, since the slope $v(a_p)=1$. In fact, we show the reduction is determined according to the following trichotomy: whether the valuation of this quantity is equal to, greater than or less than the integer $2+v(r-2)$.

Theorem 6.1. *Let $p>3$, $r\geq 2p$, with $r\equiv 2 \mod (p-1)$. Assume that $v(a_p)=1$.*

(i) If $v(a_p^2 - \binom{r}{2}p^2) = 2 + v(r-2)$, *then*

$$\bar{V}_{k,a_p}^{ss} \cong \mu_\lambda \cdot \omega^2 \oplus \mu_{\lambda^{-1}} \cdot \omega$$

where $\lambda = \overline{\dfrac{2\,(a_p^2 - \binom{r}{2}p^2)}{(2-r)pa_p}} \in \bar{\mathbb{F}}_p^\times$.

(ii) If $v(a_p^2 - \binom{r}{2}p^2) > 2 + v(r-2)$, *then* $\bar{V}_{k,a_p} \cong \mathrm{ind}(\omega_2^{p+2})$.

(iii) If $v(a_p^2 - \binom{r}{2}p^2) < 2 + v(r-2)$, *then* $\bar{V}_{k,a_p} \cong \mathrm{ind}(\omega_2^{3})$.

Remark 6.2. When $a = 2$, there are *a priori* three possibilities for $\bar{V}_{k,a_p}^{ss}$, if one counts the reducible cases as one possibility. Remarkably, the theorem shows that all three possibilities do indeed occur. The first case in the theorem is the generic case: for most r, in fact for $r \not\equiv 2 \mod p$, we have $v(r-2) = 0$; furthermore the condition $v(a_p^2 - \binom{r}{2}p^2) = 2$ holds whenever the unit $(\frac{a_p}{p})^2$ and the binomial coefficient $\binom{r}{2}$ have distinct reductions in $\bar{\mathbb{F}}_p$.

6.1. **Preliminaries.** Let us introduce some convenient notation. For $x \in \mathbb{Q}$, x non-negative, write $O(p^x)$ for an integral function multiplied by a constant with valuation greater than or equal to x. Throughout this section let us denote

$$c := \frac{a_p^2 - \binom{r}{2}p^2}{pa_p},$$

and set $\tau = v(c)$, $t = v(2-r)$ and $t_0 = \min(\tau, t)$.

Lemma 6.3. *Let* $p > 3$, *and let* $r \geq 2p$, *with* $r \equiv 2 \mod (p-1)$. *If*

$$\chi = \sum_{\ell=0}^{t} a_p^\ell \, [g_{\ell,0}^0, Y^r - X^{r-2}Y^2],$$

then

$$(T - a_p)\chi = [\alpha, Y^r] + a_p[1, X^{r-2}Y^2] + p^{t+1}h_\chi + O(p^{t_0+2}),$$

where h_χ *is an integral linear combination of terms of the form* $[g, X^r]$ *and* $[g, X^{r-1}Y]$, *for* $g \in G$.

Proof. Write $\chi = \sum_{t=0}^{t} \chi_l$, where $\chi_l := a_p^l\,[g_{l,0}^0, Y^r - X^{r-2}Y^2]$, for $l \geq 0$. By the formula for the Hecke operator,

$$T^-\chi_0 = [\alpha, Y^r] + O(p^{t_0+2}) \quad \text{and} \quad -a_p\chi_0 + T^-\chi_1 = a_p[1, X^{r-2}Y^2] + O(p^{t_0+2}),$$

as $r - 2 > t + 2 \geq t_0 + 2$. Similarly, for $1 \leq l \leq t-1$, one computes

$$T^-\chi_{l+1} - a_p\chi_l + T^+\chi_{l-1} = p^{t+1}h_l + O(p^{t_0+2}),$$

where each h_l is an integral linear combination of terms of the form $[g, X^{r-1}Y]$. Here we use the facts that for $j \geq 3$, $v(p^j\binom{r}{j}) \geq t+3$, by Lemma 2.6, and that $v(\binom{r}{2}-1) \geq t$, therefore $v(p^2(\binom{r}{2}-1)) \geq t+2$ and $v(a_p^2 - p^2) = v(pa_pc + p^2(\binom{r}{2}-1)) \geq \min(\tau+2, t+2) = t_0 + 2$. Similarly for $l = t$, we compute

$$-a_p\chi_t + T^+\chi_{t-1} = p^{t+1}h_t + O(p^{t_0+2}),$$

where h_t is an integral linear combination of terms of the form $[g, X^{r-1}Y]$ and $[g, Y^r]$. Finally

$$T^+\chi_t = p^{t+1}h_{t+1} + O(p^{t_0+2}),$$

where h_{t+1} is an integral linear combination of terms of the form $[g, X^{r-1}Y]$. Combining all the equations above, we obtain the lemma, with $h_\chi = \sum_{l=1}^{t+1} h_l$. □

For $g \in G$, set

$$\chi_g := g\chi = \sum_{\ell=0}^{t} a_p^\ell \, [gg_{\ell,0}^0, Y^r - X^{r-2}Y^2].$$

By Proposition 3.3 (ii) (b), the JH factors of P are given by $J_0 = V_{p-1} \otimes D$ and $J_2 = V_{p-3} \otimes D^2$, and in addition, $J_1 = V_0 \otimes D$ when $r \gneq 2p$ (we set $J_1 = 0$ when $r = 2p$). Recall that the factors F_i of $\bar{\Theta}$ are quotients of $\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G J_i$, for $i = 0, 1, 2$, as explained in Diagrams (3.1) and (3.2). We now study each of the factors F_i in turn, starting with F_2.

6.2. **Study of F_2.** The following proposition tells us about F_2, when $t \leq \tau$.

Proposition 6.4. *Let $p > 3$, $r \geq 2p$, with $r \equiv 2 \mod (p-1)$ and assume $v(a_p) = 1$.*

- *(i) If $\tau > t$, then $F_2 = 0$.*
- *(ii) If $\tau = t$, then F_2 is a quotient of $\pi(p-3, \lambda^{-1}, \omega^2)$, where $\lambda = \overline{\dfrac{2(a_p^2 - \binom{r}{2}p^2)}{pa_p(2-r)}} \in \bar{\mathbb{F}}_p^\times$.*

Proof. Assume $t \leq \tau$, so $t_0 = t$ in Lemma 6.3. Let $f = f_0 + f_\infty \in \mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G \mathrm{Sym}^r \bar{\mathbb{Q}}_p^2$, with

$$\begin{aligned} f_0 &= \frac{p-1}{pa_p(2-r)} \left[1, \sum_{\substack{0<j<r \\ j \equiv 2 \mod (p-1)}} \binom{r}{j} X^{r-j}Y^j + \frac{p(r-2)}{2} X^{r-2}Y^2 \right], \\ f_\infty &= \frac{1}{p(2-r)} \left(\sum_{\lambda \in \mathbb{F}_p^\times} \chi_{g_{1,[\lambda]}^0} + (1-p)\chi_{g_{1,0}^0} \right). \end{aligned}$$

We have $T^- f_0 = O(p)$. Indeed

$$T^- f_0 = \frac{p-1}{pa_p(2-r)} \left[\alpha, \sum_{\substack{0<j<r \\ j \equiv 2 \mod (p-1)}} \binom{r}{j} p^{r-j} X^{r-j}Y^j \right] + O(p),$$

and for all j in the sum, we have $r - j \geq p - 1 \geq 3$, so this is a consequence of Lemma 2.6. Also,

$$\begin{aligned} T^+ f_0 = \frac{p-1}{pa_p(2-r)} \Bigg(&\sum_{\lambda \in \mathbb{F}_p^\times} \left[g_{1,[\lambda]}^0, \sum_{i=0}^{r} p^i (-[\lambda])^{2-i} \left(\sum_{\substack{0<j<r \\ j \equiv 2 \mod (p-1)}} \binom{r}{j}\binom{j}{i} + \frac{p(r-2)}{2}\binom{2}{i} \right) X^{r-i}Y^i \right] \\ &+ \left[g_{1,0}^0, \sum_{\substack{0<j<r \\ j \equiv 2 \mod (p-1)}} \binom{r}{j} p^j X^{r-j}Y^j + \frac{p^3(r-2)}{2} X^{r-2}Y^2 \right] \Bigg). \end{aligned}$$

By parts (1) and (2) of Proposition 2.8, we may write $\sum_j \binom{r}{j} + p(r-2)/2 = p^{t+2}a$, and $\sum_j j\binom{r}{j} + p(r-2) = p^{t+1}b$, for some $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}_p$. Moreover, by part (3) and (4) of the same proposition, we have $p^2 \sum_j \binom{j}{2}\binom{r}{j} + p^3(r-2)/2 = p^2\binom{r}{2}/(1-p) \mod p^{t+3}$ and $p^i \sum_j \binom{j}{i}\binom{r}{j} = 0 \mod p^{t+3}$, for $i \geq 3$. Here all four sums are over j with $0 < j < r$ and $j \equiv 2 \mod (p-1)$. Hence, we may write

$$\begin{aligned} T^+ f_0 &= \frac{p-1}{pa_p(2-r)}\Bigg(\sum_{\lambda \in \mathbb{F}_p^\times}\left[g^0_{1,[\lambda]}, [\lambda]^2 a p^{t+2} X^r - b[\lambda]p^{t+2}X^{r-1}Y + p^2\frac{\binom{r}{2}}{1-p}X^{r-2}Y^2\right] \\ &+ \left[g^0_{1,0}, \binom{r}{2}p^2 X^{r-2}Y^2\right]\Bigg) + O(p), \end{aligned}$$

by Lemma 2.6.

On the other hand, a simple computation shows that

$$\frac{1}{p(2-r)}\left(\sum_{\lambda \in \mathbb{F}_p^\times}[g^0_{1,[\lambda]}\alpha, Y^r] + (1-p)[g^0_{1,0}\alpha, Y^r]\right) = \frac{p-1}{p(2-r)}\left[1, \sum_{\substack{0<j<r \\ j \equiv 2 \mod (p-1)}}\binom{r}{j}X^{r-j}Y^j\right],$$

so, by Lemma 6.3, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (T - a_p)f_\infty &= \frac{p-1}{p(2-r)}\left[1, \sum_{\substack{0<j<r \\ j \equiv 2 \mod (p-1)}}\binom{r}{j}X^{r-j}Y^j\right] \\ &+ \frac{a_p}{p(2-r)}\sum_{\lambda \in \mathbb{F}_p^\times}[g^0_{1,[\lambda]}, X^{r-2}Y^2] + \frac{a_p(1-p)}{p(2-r)}[g^0_{1,0}, X^{r-2}Y^2] + h + O(p), \end{aligned}$$

where h is an integral linear combination of terms of the form $[g, X^r]$ and $[g, X^{r-1}Y]$, for $g \in G$.

Putting everything together we obtain:

$$(T - a_p)f = (T - a_p)(f_0 + f_\infty) = \frac{a_p^2 - \binom{r}{2}p^2}{pa_p(2-r)}\sum_{\lambda \in \mathbb{F}_p}[g^0_{1,[\lambda]}, X^{r-2}Y^2] - \frac{1}{2}[1, X^{r-2}Y^2] + h' + O(p),$$

where h' is an integral linear combination of elements of the form $[g, X^r]$ and $[g, X^{r-1}Y]$, for $g \in G$.

By Lemma 3.4 (iii), for $a = 2$, we see $X^{r-1}Y$ and X^r die in J_2, and $X^{r-2}Y^2$ maps to $X^{p-3} \in J_2$. Thus the image of $(T - a_p)f$ in $\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G J_2$ is

$$\overline{\frac{a_p^2 - \binom{r}{2}p^2}{pa_p(2-r)}}\sum_{\lambda \in \mathbb{F}_p}[g^0_{1,[\lambda]}, X^{p-3}] - \frac{1}{2}[1, X^{p-3}],$$

which immediately proves both parts of the proposition. □

6.3. **Study of F_1.** Before studying the structure of F_1, let us first prove the following useful lemma.

Lemma 6.5. *Let $p \geq 3$, $r \geq 2p$ and $r \equiv 2 \mod (p-1)$.*

(i) The image of $X^{r-1}Y$ in P lands in W_1 and maps to $-\frac{r}{2}$, under the map $W_1 \twoheadrightarrow J_1$.

(ii) If $p \mid r$, then $X^{r-1}Y \equiv \theta X^{r-p-1} \mod X_r + V_r^{**}$.

Proof. By Lemma 3.4 (iii), $X^{r-1}Y$ maps to $0 \in J_2$, so it lands in W_1. The polynomial $X^{r-1}Y - XY^{r-1} \equiv \theta \cdot (X^{r-p-1} + \frac{r-2p}{p-1} \cdot X^{r-2p}Y^{p-1} + Y^{r-p-1}) \mod V_r^{**}$ and so it maps to $-r \in J_1$, by Lemma 3.4 (ii). As Γ acts by determinant on J_1, and as $XY^{r-1} = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{smallmatrix}\right) \cdot X^{r-1}Y$, we obtain that $X^{r-1}Y$ and $Y^{r-1}X$ map to $-r/2$ and $r/2$ respectively in J_1, proving (i).

If $p \mid r$, then $X^{r-1}Y$ maps to $0 \in J_1$, so in fact it lands in $W_0 \subset P$. Now consider the polynomial $F(X,Y) = \sum\limits_{k \in \mathbb{F}_p} k^{p-2}(kX+Y)^r \in X_r$. Using the fact $p \mid r$, we obtain

$$F(X,Y) \equiv - \sum_{\substack{0 \le j \le r \\ j \equiv 1 \mod (p-1)}} \binom{r}{j} X^{r-j}Y^j \equiv -2X^{r-p}Y^p + H(X,Y) \mod p,$$

where $H(X,Y) = 2X^{r-p}Y^p - \sum\limits_{\substack{1 < j < r-1 \\ j \equiv 1 \mod (p-1)}} \binom{r}{j} X^{r-j}Y^j$. One checks that $H(X,Y) \in V_r^{**}$, using the criteria given in [BG15, Lem 2.3]. Thus we have $X^{r-p}Y^p \in X_r + V_r^{**}$, proving (ii). □

Proposition 6.6. *Let $p \geq 3$, $r \geq 2p$, with $r \equiv 2 \mod (p-1)$ and assume $v(a_p) = 1$.*

(i) If $p \mid r$, then $F_1 = 0$.

(ii) If $p \nmid r$, then F_1 is a proper quotient of $\pi(0, \nu, \omega)$, with $\nu = \overline{\dfrac{rp}{2a_p}} \in \bar{\mathbb{F}}_p^\times$.

Proof. Recall that the JH factor $J_1 = V_0 \otimes D$ of P occurs only when $r > 2p$. Therefore $F_1 = 0$ for $r = 2p$, and we assume $r > 2p$ for the rest of the proof.

If $p \mid r$, we consider the function

$$f_0 = \left[\mathrm{Id}, \frac{X^{r-p}Y^p - X^{r-2p+1}Y^{2p-1}}{a_p}\right] \in \mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G \mathrm{Sym}^r \bar{\mathbb{Q}}_p^2, \tag{6.1}$$

and check that $T^- f_0$ dies mod p, and that $T^+ f_0$ maps to $\sum\limits_{\lambda \in \mathbb{F}_p^*} \left[g_{1,[\lambda]}^0, \dfrac{p}{a_p} \cdot \theta X^{r-p-1}\right]$ in $\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G P$, by Lemma 6.5 (ii). Clearly $T^+ f_0$ maps to zero in $\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G J_1$. Thus $(T - a_p) f_0$ maps to the image of $-a_p f_0 \equiv [\mathrm{Id}, -\theta X^{r-2p}Y^{p-1}]$ in $\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G J_1$, which is $[\mathrm{Id}, -1]$ by Lemma 3.4 (ii). As $[\mathrm{Id}, -1]$ generates $\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G J_1$ over G, we have $F_1 = 0$.

If $p \nmid r$, we consider the function $f = f_0 + f_1 \in \mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G \mathrm{Sym}^r \bar{\mathbb{Q}}_p^2$, where

$$f_0 = \left[\mathrm{Id}, -\frac{r}{2a_p} \cdot (X^{r-1}Y - 2X^{r-p}Y^p + X^{r-2p+1}Y^{2p-1})\right], \tag{6.2}$$

$$f_1 = \left[g_{1,0}^0, \frac{1}{p} \cdot (X^{r-1}Y - X^{r-p}Y^p)\right]. \tag{6.3}$$

As $r > 2p$, both $T^- f_0$ and $T^- f_1$ die mod p. Then we compute

$$\begin{aligned} -a_p f_0 &\equiv \left[\mathrm{Id}, \frac{r}{2} \cdot (\theta X^{r-p-1} - \theta X^{r-2p}Y^{p-1})\right] \mod p, \\ T^+ f_0 - a_p f_1 &\equiv \left[g_{1,0}^0, -\frac{rp}{2a_p} \cdot X^{r-1}Y - \frac{a_p}{p} \cdot \theta X^{r-p-1}\right] \mod p, \\ T^+ f_1 &\equiv \sum_{\lambda \in \mathbb{F}_p} \left[g_{2,p[\lambda]}^0, X^{r-1}Y\right] \mod p. \end{aligned}$$

Clearly $(T-a_p)f$ is integral and its image in $\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G J_2$ is 0 by Lemma 3.4 (iii). Therefore $(T-a_p)f$ lands in $\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G W_1 \subset \mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G P$. Applying Lemma 3.4 (ii) and Lemma 6.5 (i), we obtain that it maps to

$$-\frac{r}{2}\cdot\left([\mathrm{Id},\,1]-\left[g_{1,0}^0,\,\frac{rp}{2a_p}\right]+\sum_{\lambda\in\mathbb{F}_p}\left[g_{2,p[\lambda]}^0,\,1\right]\right)=-\frac{r}{2}\cdot\left(T-\frac{rp}{2a_p}\right)\left[g_{1,0}^0,\,1\right]\in \mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G J_1.$$

Since $r\not\equiv 0 \mod p$, and as $\left[g_{1,0}^0,\,1\right]$ generates $\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G J_1$ over G, the map $\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G J_1 \twoheadrightarrow F_1$ must factor through $\pi(0,\overline{\frac{rp}{2a_p}},\omega)$.

Since $\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G J_1 \cong (\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G \bar{\mathbb{F}}_p)\otimes(\omega\circ\det)$, the elements of $\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G J_1$ can be thought of as compactly supported $\bar{\mathbb{F}}_p$-valued functions on the Bruhat-Tits tree of $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Q}_p)$, with the usual right translation action of G twisted by $\omega\circ\det$. Now $(T-a_p)f_1$ is integral and maps to $-\frac{r}{2}\cdot\sum\limits_{\lambda\in\mathbb{F}_p}[g_{2,p[\lambda]}^0,\,1]$ in $\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G J_1$. Using the definition of the usual sum-of-neighbours action of the Hecke operator on functions on the tree, or the formula for T given in (2.1), we can see that this function cannot lie in the image of $T-\nu$, for any $\nu\in\bar{\mathbb{F}}_p^\times$. This shows that F_1 must be a proper quotient of $\pi(0,\overline{\frac{rp}{2a_p}},\omega)$. $\square$

6.4. **Study of** F_0**.** Recall $c:=(a_p^2-\binom{r}{2}p^2)/pa_p$, $\tau=v(c)$, $t=v(2-r)$. We study F_0, when $\tau\le t$.

Proposition 6.7. *Let $p\ge 3$, $r\ge 2p$, with $r\equiv 2 \mod (p-1)$ and assume $v(a_p)=1$.*

- *(i) If $\tau<t$, then $F_0=0$.*
- *(ii) If $\tau=t$, then F_0 is a quotient of $\pi(p-1,\lambda,\omega)$, where $\lambda=\overline{\dfrac{2(a_p^2-\binom{r}{2}p^2)}{pa_p(2-r)}}\in\bar{\mathbb{F}}_p^\times$.*

Proof. Let $r\ge 2p$. Write $r=2+n(p-1)p^t$, with $t\ge 0$ and $n\ge 1$, n co-prime to p. We assume that $\tau\le t$.

Since the functions we will define below are slightly more complicated than others that have occurred so far, we first define some basic 'building block' functions. Let

$$A=[1,X^{r-1}Y],\quad B=\left[1,\sum_{\substack{1<j<r-1\\ j\equiv 1 \mod (p-1)}}\binom{r-1}{j}X^{r-j}Y^j\right]\quad\text{and}\quad C=[1,X^{r-p}Y^p].$$

We set $A'=A-C$ and $B'=B+(r-1)C$. Also, for $g\in G$, let

$$\Phi_g=[g,\sum_{\substack{1<j\le r-1\\ j\equiv 1 \mod (p-1)}}\binom{r}{j}X^{r-j}Y^j+(r-2)X^{r-p}Y^p]\quad\text{and}\quad \Psi_g=\sum_{\mu\in\mathbb{F}_p^\times}[\mu]^{-1}\chi_{gg_{1,[\mu]}^0},$$

where χ_g is defined in Section 6.1.

Now consider the function $f = f_0 + f_1 + f_\infty \in \mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^{G} \mathrm{Sym}^r \bar{\mathbb{Q}}_p^2$, with

$$\begin{aligned} f_0 &= \frac{1-p}{pc}\left(A' + \frac{rp^2}{2a_p^2}B'\right) = \frac{1-p}{pc}\left(A + \frac{rp^2}{2a_p^2}B\right) + \frac{p-1}{a_p}C, \\ f_1 &= \frac{-1}{2a_pc}\left(\sum_{\lambda\in\mathbb{F}_p^\times} \Phi_{g^0_{1,[\lambda]}} + (1-p)\Phi_{g^0_{1,0}}\right), \\ f_\infty &= \frac{1}{2c}\left(\frac{1}{1-p}\sum_{\lambda\in\mathbb{F}_p^\times} \Psi_{g^0_{1,[\lambda]}} + \Psi_{g^0_{1,0}}\right). \end{aligned}$$

The equivalent expressions for f_0 above come from the identity $-1 + \frac{rp^2}{2a_p^2}(r-1) = -\frac{cp}{a_p}$.

We now compute $(T - a_p)f$ in several simpler steps.

In radius '-1', we have $T^- A = O(p^{r-1})$ and $T^- B = O(p^{t+3})$, by Lemma 2.5, since $r - j \geq p \geq 5$ and $T^- C = O(p^{r-p})$. Since $r - 1 \geq r - p \geq t + 3$, we see $T^- f_0 = O(p^2)$, and so dies mod p. We now compute the radius 0 term $-a_p f_0 + T^- f_1$. We have $T^-\Phi_g = [g\alpha, rpXY^{r-1}] + O(p^{t+3})$, by Lemma 2.6, so, for $\lambda \in \mathbb{F}_p$,

$$T^-\Phi_{g^0_{1,[\lambda]}} = rp\left[1, \sum_{i=0}^{r-1}\binom{r-1}{i}[\lambda]^{r-1-i}X^{r-i}Y^i\right] + O(p^{t+3}),$$

so

$$T^- f_1 = \frac{rp(1-p)}{2a_pc}\left[1, \sum_{\substack{1\leq j<r-1 \\ j\equiv 1 \mod (p-1)}}\binom{r-1}{j}X^{r-j}Y^j\right] + O(p^3).$$

We obtain that $-a_p f_0 + T^- f_1 = -[1, X^{r-1}Y - X^{r-p}Y^p] + O(p)$.

Denote by $h_{\infty,1}$ the part of $(T - a_p)f_\infty$ that lives in radius 1, and by $h_{\infty,2}$ the part of $(T - a_p)f_\infty$ that lives in radius 2. Let us now compute the radius 1 term $T^+ f_0 - a_p f_1 + h_{\infty,1}$.

We have

$$T^+ A = \sum_{\lambda\in\mathbb{F}_p}[g^0_{1,[\lambda]}, -[\lambda]X^r + pX^{r-1}Y], \qquad T^+ C = \sum_{\lambda\in\mathbb{F}_p}[g^0_{1,[\lambda]}, -[\lambda]X^r] + O(p^2),$$

and

$$T^+ B = \sum_{\lambda\in\mathbb{F}_p^\times}\left[g^0_{1,[\lambda]}, -[\lambda]\sum_{\substack{1<j<r-1 \\ j\equiv 1 \mod (p-1)}}\binom{r-1}{j}X^r + p\sum_{\substack{1<j<r-1 \\ j\equiv 1 \mod (p-1)}} j\binom{r-1}{j}X^{r-1}Y\right] + O(p^{t+2}),$$

using the fact that, for $i \geq 2$, $p^i \sum_{1<j<r-1}\binom{r-1}{j}\binom{j}{i} = O(p^{t+2})$, as follows from part (3) of Proposition 2.9 (and Lemma 2.5 which shows that the $j = r-1$ term is of no consequence). Using parts (1) and (2) of the same proposition we see that $\sum_{1<j<r-1}\binom{r-1}{j} = 1 - r + np^{t+1} + O(p^{t+2})$ and $p\sum_{1<j<r-1} j\binom{r-1}{j} = p^2(r-1)/(1-p) + O(p^{t+2})$. All three sums here are as usual over $j \equiv 1$

mod $(p-1)$. Substituting, we get

$$T^+B = \sum_{\lambda\in\mathbb{F}_p^\times} [g^0_{1,[\lambda]}, -[\lambda]\left(1-r+np^{t+1}\right)X^r + \frac{p^2(r-1)}{1-p}X^{r-1}Y] + O(p^{t+2}).$$

This gives

$$T^+f_0 = \frac{1-p}{c}[g^0_{1,0}, X^{r-1}Y] + \frac{1}{c}\sum_{\lambda\in\mathbb{F}_p^\times}[g^0_{1,[\lambda]}, X^{r-1}Y] + h + O(p).$$

where h is an integral linear combination of terms of the form $[g, X^r]$, with $g\in G$. Rewrite this as

$$T^+f_0 = \frac{1-p}{2c}\left[g^0_{1,0}, \binom{r}{1}X^{r-1}Y\right] + \frac{1}{2c}\sum_{\lambda\in\mathbb{F}_p^\times}\left[g^0_{1,[\lambda]}, \binom{r}{1}X^{r-1}Y\right] + \frac{2-r}{2c}\sum_{\lambda\in\mathbb{F}_p}[g^0_{1,[\lambda]}, X^{r-1}Y] + h + O(p).$$

We also have

$$\begin{aligned} -a_pf_1 \;&=\; \frac{1-p}{2c}\left[g^0_{1,0}, \sum_{\substack{1<j\le r-1 \\ j\equiv 1 \mod (p-1)}}\binom{r}{j}X^{r-j}Y^j\right] + \frac{1}{2c}\sum_{\lambda\in\mathbb{F}_p^\times}\left[g^0_{1,[\lambda]}, \sum_{\substack{1<j\le r-1 \\ j\equiv 1 \mod (p-1)}}\binom{r}{j}X^{r-j}Y^j\right] \\ &\qquad - \frac{2-r}{2c}\sum_{\lambda\in\mathbb{F}_p}[g^0_{1,[\lambda]}, X^{r-p}Y^p]. \end{aligned}$$

So

$$\begin{aligned} T^+f_0 - a_pf_1 &= \frac{1-p}{2c}\left[g^0_{1,0}, \sum_{\substack{1\le j\le r-1 \\ j\equiv 1 \mod (p-1)}}\binom{r}{j}X^{r-j}Y^j\right] + \frac{1}{2c}\sum_{\lambda\in\mathbb{F}_p^\times}\left[g^0_{1,[\lambda]}, \sum_{\substack{1\le j\le r-1 \\ j\equiv 1 \mod (p-1)}}\binom{r}{j}X^{r-j}Y^j\right] \\ &\qquad + \frac{2-r}{2c}\sum_{\lambda\in\mathbb{F}_p}[g^0_{1,[\lambda]}, X^{r-1}Y - X^{r-p}Y^p] + h + O(p). \end{aligned}$$

We now observe, by Lemma 6.3, that

$$(T-a_p)\Psi_g = (p-1)\left[g, \sum_{\substack{1\le j\le r-1 \\ j\equiv 1 \mod (p-1)}}\binom{r}{j}X^{r-j}Y^j\right] + a_p\sum_{\mu\in\mathbb{F}_p^\times}[\mu]^{-1}[gg^0_{1,[\mu]}, X^{r-2}Y^2] + O(p^{\tau+1}),$$

since $t_0=\tau$. We deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} (T-a_p)f_\infty &= \frac{-1}{2c}\left((1-p)\left[g^0_{1,0}, \sum_{\substack{1\le j\le r-1 \\ j\equiv 1 \mod (p-1)}}\binom{r}{j}X^{r-j}Y^j\right] + \sum_{\lambda\in\mathbb{F}_p^\times}\left[g^0_{1,[\lambda]}, \sum_{\substack{1\le j\le r-1 \\ j\equiv 1 \mod (p-1)}}\binom{r}{j}X^{r-j}Y^j\right]\right) \\ &\quad + \frac{a_p}{2c}\left(\sum_{\mu\in\mathbb{F}_p^\times}[\mu]^{-1}[g^0_{1,0}g^0_{1,[\mu]}, X^{r-2}Y^2] + \frac{1}{1-p}\sum_{\lambda\in\mathbb{F}_p^\times}\sum_{\mu\in\mathbb{F}_p^\times}[\mu]^{-1}[g^0_{1,[\lambda]}g^0_{1,[\mu]}, X^{r-2}Y^2]\right) + O(p). \end{aligned}$$

Putting everything together, in radius 1 we get that

$$T^+f_0 - a_pf_1 + h_{\infty,1} = \frac{2-r}{2c}\sum_{\lambda\in\mathbb{F}_p}[g^0_{1,[\lambda]}, X^{r-1}Y - X^{r-p}Y^p] + h + O(p).$$

Finally, let us compute the radius 2 term $T^+f_1 + h_{\infty,2}$. We have

$$T^+\Phi_g = \sum_{\mu\in\mathbb{F}_p}\left[gg^0_{1,[\mu]}, \sum_{i\geq 0} p^i \sum_{\substack{1<j\leq r-1 \\ j\equiv 1 \mod (p-1)}} (-[\mu])^{j-i}\binom{j}{i}\binom{r}{j}X^{r-i}Y^i + (r-2)\sum_{i=0}^{p}(-[\mu])^{p-i}p^i\binom{p}{i}X^{r-i}Y^i\right].$$

Using all parts of Proposition 2.10, we get

$$T^+\Phi_g = \sum_{\mu\in\mathbb{F}_p^\times}\frac{[\mu]^{-1}}{1-p}\left[gg^0_{1,[\mu]}, p^2\binom{r}{2}X^{r-2}Y^2\right] + p^{t+1}h' + O(p^{t+2}),$$

where h' is an integral linear combination of terms of the form $[g, X^r]$, for $g \in G$. So

$$\frac{-1}{2a_pc}T^+\Phi_g = \frac{-p^2\binom{r}{2}}{2a_pc(1-p)}\sum_{\mu\in\mathbb{F}_p^\times}[\mu]^{-1}[gg^0_{1,[\mu]}, X^{r-2}Y^2] + h'' + O(p),$$

where h'' is an integral linear combination of terms of the form $[g, X^r]$, for $g \in G$. Notice that $\frac{-p^2\binom{r}{2}}{2a_pc(1-p)} = -\frac{a_p}{2c(1-p)} + O(p)$, so finally we get

$$T^+f_1 = \frac{-a_p}{2c}\left(\frac{1}{1-p}\sum_{\lambda\in\mathbb{F}_p^\times}\sum_{\mu\in\mathbb{F}_p^\times}[\mu]^{-1}[g^0_{1,[\lambda]}g^0_{1,[\mu]}, X^{r-2}Y^2] + \sum_{\mu\in\mathbb{F}_p^\times}[\mu]^{-1}[g^0_{1,0}g^0_{1,[\mu]}, X^{r-2}Y^2]\right) + h''' + O(p),$$

where h''' is an integral linear combination of terms of the form $[g, X^r]$, for $g \in G$. Thus in radius 2, we get that $T^+f_1 + h_{\infty,2} = h''' + O(p)$.

So, putting everything together, we see that

$$(T - a_p)f = \frac{2-r}{2c}\sum_{\lambda\in\mathbb{F}_p}[g^0_{1,[\lambda]}, \theta X^{r-p-1}] - [1, \theta X^{r-p-1}] + h'''' + O(p), \tag{6.4}$$

where h'''' is an integral linear combination of terms of the form $[g, X^r]$, for $g \in G$.

Now the term h'''' above dies in $\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G P$. Moreover, by Lemma 3.4 (i), θX^{r-p-1} can be identified with $X^{p-1} \in J_0$. So, we see that the image of $(T - a_p)f$ in $\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G P$ lies in $\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G J_0$ and is

$$\overline{\frac{2-r}{2c}}\sum_{\lambda\in\mathbb{F}_p}[g^0_{1,[\lambda]}, X^{p-1}] - [1, X^{p-1}].$$

This immediately implies both parts of the proposition. □

6.5. **Conclusion.**

Proof of Theorem 6.1. We apply Proposition 6.4, Proposition 6.6 and Proposition 6.7 to find the possible structures of F_2, F_1 and F_0 respectively. In each case we obtain a unique possibility for the semisimplification of $\bar{\Theta}$ and we conclude using the (semisimple) mod p Local Langlands Correspondence (LLC).

(i) If $v(a_p^2 - \binom{r}{2}p^2) = v(r-2)+2$, then let λ be the reduction mod p of $\frac{2(a_p^2-\binom{r}{2}p^2)}{pa_p(2-r)}$, which is in $\bar{\mathbb{F}}_p^\times$. Then F_2 is a quotient of the principal series representation $\pi(p-3, \lambda^{-1}, \omega^2)$, $F_1 = 0$ if $p \mid r$ and is otherwise a quotient of $\pi(0, \nu, \omega)$, with $\nu = \overline{\frac{rp}{2a_p}} \in \bar{\mathbb{F}}_p^\times$, and F_0 is a quotient of $\pi(p-1, \lambda, \omega)$.

Thus none of F_0, F_1 or F_2 can have a supersingular JH factor, and $\bar{\Theta}$ is forced to be reducible with semisimplification $\pi(p-1,\lambda,\omega)^{ss} \oplus \pi(p-3,\lambda^{-1},\omega^2)$.

(ii) If $v(a_p^2 - \binom{r}{2}p^2) > v(r-2)+2$, then $F_2 = 0$, $F_1 = 0$ if $p \mid r$ and is otherwise a quotient of $\pi(0,\nu,\omega)$. Again the mod p LLC forces $F_1 = 0$, and hence $\bar{\Theta} \cong F_0 \cong \pi(p-1,0,\omega)$.

(iii) If $v(a_p^2 - \binom{r}{2}p^2) < v(r-2)+2$, then necessarily $r \equiv 2 \mod p$, so F_1 is a proper quotient of $\pi(0,\overline{\frac{p}{a_p}},\omega)$, and $F_0 = 0$. Since $\bar{\Theta}$ lies in the image of the mod p LLC, we must have $F_1 = 0$, and hence $\bar{\Theta} \cong F_2 \cong \pi(p-3,0,\omega^2)$.

□

Remark 6.8. In part (i), clearly $F_2 \neq 0$. Also, if $\lambda \neq \overline{\frac{rp}{2a_p}}$, then $F_0 = \pi(p-1,\lambda,\omega)$ and $F_1 = 0$, as we will see in Proposition 7.35. If $\lambda = \overline{\frac{rp}{2a_p}}$, then $\lambda = \pm 1$. In this case, an additional possibility in part (i) is that $F_0 = \mathrm{St} \otimes (\mu_\lambda \cdot \omega \circ \det)$ and $F_1 = \mu_\lambda \cdot \omega \circ \det \neq 0$, by Proposition 6.6 (ii). This might explain why it does not seem possible to show that $F_1 = 0$ uniformly in all three parts.

7. Reduction without semisimplification

In this section we investigate more subtle properties of the reduction $\bar{V}_{k,a_p}$. In particular, if the reduction is reducible and non-split, we wish to describe what type of extension one obtains. We shall assume throughout that $p \geq 5$, except for the last subsection where we allow $p = 3$.

7.1. **Results.**

In earlier sections we computed the semisimplification $\bar{V}_{k,a_p}^{ss}$ of $\bar{V}_{k,a_p}$, using a particular lattice. In [Col10], Colmez defined functors (see Section 7.2 for more details) that give a correspondence between certain G-stable lattices in Π_{k,a_p} or its p-adic completion $\hat{\Pi}_{k,a_p}$ with respect to the lattice Θ_{k,a_p}, and $G_{\mathbb{Q}_p}$-stable lattices in V_{k,a_p}, in a way that is compatible with reduction modulo p. So by choosing a suitable lattice Θ' inside $\hat{\Pi}_{k,a_p}$ we get a lattice inside V_{k,a_p}, which we denote by $V(\Theta')$, and the reduction of $V(\Theta')$ can be computed from $\bar{\Theta}'$, it is simply $V(\bar{\Theta}')$.

In this section we apply this in order to primarily investigate the following question. Assume that $\overline{V}_{k,a_p}^{ss}$ is isomorphic to $\omega \oplus 1$ (up to a twist). It is well known, by work of Ribet, that there is a lattice inside V_{k,a_p} that reduces to a non-split extension of 1 by ω (up to a twist). One can ask whether this extension is "peu ramifiée" or "très ramifiée" in the sense of [Ser87]. The answer does not depend on the choice of the lattice, which is unique up to homothety. In fact, the extension is given by a (non-zero) class in $\mathrm{H}^1(G_{\mathbb{Q}_p}, \bar{\mathbb{F}}_p(\omega)) = \mathbb{Q}_p^\times/(\mathbb{Q}_p^\times)^p \otimes \bar{\mathbb{F}}_p$, which has dimension 2 over $\bar{\mathbb{F}}_p$, and changing the basis used to define this cohomolgy class only changes the class by a (non-zero) constant. The extensions corresponding to the (non-zero) elements in the line $\mathbb{Z}_p^\times/(\mathbb{Z}_p^\times)^p \otimes \bar{\mathbb{F}}_p$ are called "peu ramifiée", whereas the extensions corresponding to the remaining (non-zero) classes are (by definition) called "très ramifiée". In the context of the results proved so far in this paper (see Sections 4 through 6 and Theorem 1.1), this question arises in exactly two cases:

(1) $a = p-1$, p does not divide $r+1$ and $\lambda = \overline{\frac{a_p}{p(r+1)}} = \pm 1$, so $\overline{\frac{a_p}{p}} = \pm\overline{(r+1)}$.

(2) $a = 2$, $v(a_p^2 - \binom{r}{2}p^2) = 2 + v(r-2)$ and $\overline{u(a_p)} = \bar{\varepsilon}$, with $\varepsilon = \pm 1$, so $\overline{\frac{a_p}{p}} = \varepsilon\overline{\tfrac{r}{2}}$ or $\varepsilon\overline{(1-r)}$, where

$$u(a_p) := \frac{2(a_p^2 - \binom{r}{2}p^2)}{(2-r)pa_p}$$

is a p-adic unit.

In these cases, the standard lattice $\Theta = \Theta_{k,a_p}$ studied in Section 4 (when $a = p-1$) and Section 6 (when $a = 2$) does not always allow us to answer the question. For instance, in the first case $V(\bar{\Theta})$ is a twist of an extension of ω by 1, and in the second case $V(\bar{\Theta})$ is a split extension when $F_1 = 0$ (see Corollary 7.4).

We can however, study the reduction of certain non-standard lattices, and prove the following result. To simplify the statement, we introduce the following terminology. Let $\varepsilon \in \{\pm 1\}$. Assume we are in case (2) above, so that $r \equiv 2 \mod (p-1)$. The question of "peu" or "très ramifiée" arises when

$$\frac{a_p}{p} \in \left\{ \alpha \in \bar{\mathbb{Q}}_p \;\middle|\; v(\alpha) = 0,\ v\left(\alpha - \binom{r}{2}\alpha^{-1}\right) = v(r-2),\ \overline{\frac{2(\alpha - \binom{r}{2}\alpha^{-1})}{2-r}} = \bar{\varepsilon} \right\}.$$

Assume further that $r \not\equiv 2/3 \mod p$. It's easy to see then that this (big) set is a disjoint union of two sets

$$\left\{\alpha \in \bar{\mathbb{Q}}_p : v(\alpha) = 0, v(\alpha - \varepsilon r/2) > v(r-2)\right\} \sqcup \left\{\alpha \in \bar{\mathbb{Q}}_p : v(\alpha) = 0, v(\alpha - \varepsilon(1-r)) > v(r-2)\right\}.$$

The first set is empty if $r \equiv 0 \mod p$ and the second is empty if $r \equiv 1 \mod p$.

Definition 7.1. We say that 'a_p is close to $\varepsilon pr/2$' if a_p/p is in the first set, and that 'a_p is close to $\varepsilon p(1-r)$' if a_p/p is in the second set.

For a_p/p in the big set above, a_p is close to $\varepsilon pr/2$ if and only if $\overline{a_p/p} = \overline{\varepsilon r/2}$, and similarly, a_p is close to $\varepsilon p(1-r)$ if and only if $\overline{a_p/p} = \overline{\varepsilon(1-r)}$.

Theorem 7.2 (Theorems 7.18, 7.27 and 7.34)**.** *Let $p \geq 5$, let $r \geq p+1$ and assume that $v(a_p) = 1$.*

(1) Suppose $r \equiv p-1 \mod (p-1)$, p does not divide $r+1$ and $\overline{\frac{a_p}{p(r+1)}} = \bar{\varepsilon}$, with $\varepsilon \in \{\pm 1\}$. Then there exists a lattice L in V_{k,a_p} such that $\bar{L}$ is a non-split, "peu ramifiée" extension of μ_ε by $\mu_\varepsilon \cdot \omega$.

(2) Suppose that $r \equiv 2 \mod (p-1)$ and $r \not\equiv 2/3 \mod p$.

  (a) Suppose a_p is close to $\varepsilon pr/2$, for some $\varepsilon \in \{\pm 1\}$. Then there exists a lattice L in V_{k,a_p} such that $\bar{L}$ is a non-split, "peu ramifiée" extension of $\mu_\varepsilon \cdot \omega$ by $\mu_\varepsilon \cdot \omega^2$.

  (b) Suppose that a_p is close to $\varepsilon p(1-r)$, for some $\varepsilon \in \{\pm 1\}$. If $r \equiv 2 \mod p$, further assume that $u(a_p) - \varepsilon$ is a uniformizer of $E = \mathbb{Q}_p(a_p)$ or that E is unramified over $\mathbb{Q}_p$.

    (i) If $v(u(a_p) - \varepsilon) < 1$, then there exists a lattice L in V_{k,a_p} such that $\bar{L}$ is a non-split, "peu ramifiée" extension of $\mu_\varepsilon \cdot \omega$ by $\mu_\varepsilon \cdot \omega^2$.

    (ii) If $v(u(a_p) - \varepsilon) \geq 1$, then there exists a lattice L in V_{k,a_p} such that $\bar{L}$ is a non-split, "très ramifiée" extension of $\mu_\varepsilon \cdot \omega$ by $\mu_\varepsilon \cdot \omega^2$.

(iii) Moreover, depending on the choice of a_p *satisfying* $\overline{a_p/p} = \overline{\varepsilon(1-r)}$*, all isomorphism classes of "très ramifiée" extensions appear.*

The condition $r \not\equiv 2/3 \mod p$ in part (2) of the theorem ensures that once we fix ε, cases (a) and (b) above are mutually exclusive. We do not know what happens in case $r \equiv 2/3 \mod p$, although this is also a case where the distinction between "peu" and "très ramifiée" could be made. The technical conditions imposed when $r \equiv 2 \mod p$ in part (2) (b) is used in the proof of Proposition 7.45 (see also Remark 7.42) and could possibly be removed if one finds a more direct proof of Proposition 7.35.

7.2. **Colmez's Montréal functor.** Let E be a finite extension of $\mathbb{Q}_p$, with ring of integers $\mathcal{O}_E$ and residue field k_E.

We introduce the categories on which Colmez's functors are defined (see [Col10, Intro., 4.]). We denote by $\mathrm{Rep}_{\mathrm{tors}}(G)$ the category of $\mathcal{O}_E[G]$-modules that are smooth, admissible, of finite length and have a central character. We denote by $\mathrm{Rep}_{\mathcal{O}_E}(G)$ the category of $\mathcal{O}_E[G]$-modules Θ that are complete and separated for the p-adic topology, without p-torsion and such that for all n, $\Theta/p^n\Theta$ is in $\mathrm{Rep}_{\mathrm{tors}}(G)$. Finally we denote by $\mathrm{Rep}_E(G)$ the category of $E[G]$-modules Π with a lattice which is in $\mathrm{Rep}_{\mathcal{O}_E}(G)$. Hence objects of $\mathrm{Rep}_E(G)$ are p-adic Banach spaces, and the lattice as in the definition defines the topology of the Banach space.

Let Π be a p-adic Banach space. Two $\mathcal{O}_E$-lattices Θ and Θ' in Π are said to be commensurable if there exists n, m such that $p^n\Theta \subset \Theta' \subset p^m\Theta$. In this case Θ defines the topology of Π if and only if Θ' does. Let Π be in $\mathrm{Rep}_E(G)$ and $\Theta \subset \Pi$ be a lattice which is in $\mathrm{Rep}_{\mathcal{O}_E}(G)$, then any lattice Θ' that is commensurable with Θ and stable by G is also in $\mathrm{Rep}_{\mathcal{O}_E}(G)$.

In [Col10], Colmez has defined exact functors, which we all denote by V, that go from these categories to categories of continuous representations of $G_{\mathbb{Q}_p}$ with coefficients in E or $\mathcal{O}_E$. More precisely V goes from $\mathrm{Rep}_{\mathrm{tors}}(G)$ to torsion $\mathcal{O}_E$-representations of finite length, from $\mathrm{Rep}_{\mathcal{O}_E}(G)$ to representations on free $\mathcal{O}_E$-modules of finite rank, and from $\mathrm{Rep}_E(G)$ to finite-dimensional E-representations.

These various functors are compatible: if $\Pi \in \mathrm{Rep}_E(G)$ and Θ is a lattice in Π as in the definition, then $V(\Theta)$ is a lattice in $V(\Pi)$, and $V(\bar{\Theta}) = \overline{V(\Theta)}$ (see [Col10, Théoreme IV.2.14] for the properties of these functors). Moreover $V(\hat{\Pi}_{k,a_p}) = V_{k,a_p}$, and $V(\bar{\Theta}_{k,a_p})^{ss} = \bar{V}^{ss}_{k,a_p}$. We will always consider lattices in $\hat{\Pi}_{k,a_p}$ that are commensurable with $\hat{\Theta}_{k,a_p}$, and all the lattices $L \subset V_{k,a_p}$ as in Theorem 7.2 are of the form $V(\Theta')$ for such a lattice $\Theta' \subset \hat{\Pi}_{k,a_p}$.

7.3. **Preliminaries in characteristic p.** We fix a finite field k_E of characteristic p. Let St be the Steinberg representation with coefficients in k_E. The definition of St is recalled in §7.3.2 below.

7.3.1. *Extensions of* $\pi(p-3, 1, \omega)$ *by* St.

Proposition 7.3 (Proposition VII.4.22 of [Col10])**.** *Any extension of* $\pi(p-3,1,\omega)$ *by* St *is split.*

Corollary 7.4. *If* $a = 2$, $\overline{u(a_p)} = \pm 1$ *and* $F_1 = 0$, *then* $V(\bar{\Theta})$ *is a split extension of* $\mu_{\overline{u(a_p)}} \cdot \omega$ *by* $\mu_{\overline{u(a_p)}} \cdot \omega^2$.

Proof. Let us assume for simplicity that $\overline{u(a_p)} = 1$. It follows from the computations of Section 6 that in this case $\bar{\Theta}$ is an extension of $\pi(p-3, 1, \omega^2)$ by $\pi(p-1, 1, \omega)$. Hence $\bar{\Theta}$ contains a line L on which G acts by ω, and the quotient is an extension of $\pi(p-3, 1, \omega^2)$ by $\mathrm{St} \otimes \omega$, hence is split. The functor V takes the line L to zero ([Col10, Théorème 0.10]), and so $V(\bar{\Theta}) = V(\bar{\Theta}/L)$ is split. □

Remark 7.5. The conditions of Corollary 7.4 are fulfilled for example when $\overline{a_p/p} = \pm(1-r)$ and r is not 1 or 2 or 2/3 modulo p.

Remark 7.6. Note that the proof of Proposition 7.3 uses as an intermediate step the fact that if Π is an extension of $\pi(p-3, 1, \omega)$ by St, then $V(\Pi)$ is a split extension of 1 by ω.

7.3.2. *Linear forms on* St. Let $\mathcal{C}^0(\mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{Q}_p), k_E)$ be the smooth G-representation of locally constant functions on $\mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{Q}_p)$ with values in k_E. Then the Steinberg representation St is the quotient $\mathcal{C}^0(\mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{Q}_p), k_E)/k_E$ of this space by the space of constant functions.

Let A be the subgroup of G that is isomorphic to $\mathbb{Q}_p^\times$, given by the set of $\left(\begin{smallmatrix} a & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{smallmatrix}\right) \in G$, $a \in \mathbb{Q}_p^\times$, and let $i : \mathbb{Q}_p^\times \to A$, $a \mapsto \left(\begin{smallmatrix} a & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{smallmatrix}\right)$. Let $w \in G$ be the element $\left(\begin{smallmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{smallmatrix}\right)$.

Let $I(1) \subset G$ be the subgroup of K of matrices that are upper triangular and unipotent modulo p. It is well known that $\mathrm{St}^{I(1)}$ is a line. If we view St as $\mathcal{C}^0(\mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{Q}_p), k_E)/k_E$, then $\mathrm{St}^{I(1)}$ is generated by the image of the characteristic function of $\mathbb{Z}_p$.

Lemma 7.7. *There exists a non-zero linear form* $\mu : \mathrm{St} \to k_E$ *which is invariant under the action of* A. *The form* μ *is unique up to multiplication by a scalar. Moreover,* $\mu \circ w = -\mu$, *and* μ *is non-zero on* $\mathrm{St}^{I(1)}$.

Proof. The existence and uniqueness of a non-zero μ which is invariant under the action of A come from [Col10, Lemme VII.4.16]. Colmez also gives a description of such a linear form: it is a multiple of the map $f \mapsto f(0) - f(\infty)$, for $f \in \mathcal{C}^0(\mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{Q}_p), k_E)/k_E$, so the other two properties are clear. □

In fact we will use the following variant:

Lemma 7.8. *Let* $m \in \mathbb{Z}$. *There exists a non-zero linear form* $\mu : \mathrm{St} \otimes \omega^m \to \omega^m$ *which is* A*-equivariant. It is unique up to multiplication by a scalar. It satisfies* $\mu \circ w = (-1)^{m+1}\mu$, *and is non-zero on* $\mathrm{St}^{I(1)}$.

7.3.3. *Extensions of* 1 *by* St. Let $H = \mathrm{Hom}_{cont}(\mathbb{Q}_p^\times, k_E)$. In [Col10, Para. VII.4.4], Colmez attaches to any τ in H a representation E_τ of $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{Q}_p)$ with coefficients in k_E which is an extension of 1 by the Steinberg representation St and which is non-split if and only if τ is non-zero. (Note that in what follows we take E_τ to be the representation that Colmez calls $E_{-\tau}$). Any object of $\mathrm{Rep}_{\mathrm{tors}}(G)$ which is a non-split extension of 1 by St with coefficients in k_E is isomorphic to some E_τ (Théorème VII.4.18 in [Col10]).

Note that $\mathbb{Q}_p^\times = \mu_{p-1} \times (1+p\mathbb{Z}_p) \times p^{\mathbb{Z}}$. As k_E is killed by p, we see that for all $\tau \in H$, $\tau(\mu_{p-1}) = 0$. Hence τ is entirely determined by $\tau(1+p)$ and $\tau(p)$. Let $[\tau] \in \mathbb{P}^1(k_E)$ be the class of $(\tau(1+p), \tau(p))$, when the extension is not split. Then the isomorphism class of E_τ depends only on $[\tau]$.

Let Π be an extension of 1 by St. Here is a method for computing $[\tau]$, following [Col10, VII.4.4]:

Lemma 7.9. *Let* Π *be an extension of* 1 *by* St. *Let* μ *be as in Lemma 7.7 and* e *an element of* Π *that is not contained in the subrepresentation* St. *Then either* $\mu(i(1+p)e-e) = \mu(i(p)e-e) = 0$ *and the extension is split, or* Π *is isomorphic to* E_τ, *for* τ *such that* $[\tau] = (\mu(i(1+p)e-e) : \mu(i(p)e-e))$.

Note that for all $x \in \Pi$ and $g \in G$, $gx - x$ is in the subrepresentation of Π isomorphic to the Steinberg representation, so we can indeed apply μ to the given elements.

We use also the following variant:

Lemma 7.10. *Let* Π *be an extension of* ω^m *by* $\mathrm{St} \otimes \omega^m$, *for some* $m \in \mathbb{Z}$. *Let* μ *be as in Lemma 7.8 and* e *an element of* Π *that is not contained in the subrepresentation* $\mathrm{St} \otimes \omega^m$. *Then either* $\mu(i(1+p)e-e) = \mu(i(p)e-e) = 0$ *and the extension is split, or* Π *is isomorphic to* $E_\tau \otimes \omega^m$, *for* τ *such that* $[\tau] = (\mu(i(1+p)e-e) : \mu(i(p)e-e))$.

7.3.4. *Criterion for the extension to be "peu ramifiée".* Colmez shows that if $\tau \neq 0$, then there exists a unique non-split extension class of $\pi(p-3, 1, \omega)$ by E_τ which we denote by Π_τ ([Col10, Proposition VII.4.25]).

Then Colmez's functor attaches to Π_τ a Galois representation $V(\Pi_\tau)$ which is a non-split extension of 1 by ω ([Col10, Proposition VII.4.24]). The description of $V(\Pi_\tau)$ in [Col10, Para. VII.3] gives:

Proposition 7.11. $V(\Pi_\tau)$ *is a non-split extension of* 1 *by* ω *and it is a "peu ramifiée" extension if and only if* τ *is zero on* $\mathbb{Z}_p^\times$, *that is,* $[\tau] = (0 : 1)$.

Hence:

Proposition 7.12. *Suppose that* Π *is a non-split extension of* $\pi(p-3, 1, \omega^{m+1})$ *by* $E_\tau \otimes \omega^m$ *for some* $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ *and some non-zero* τ. *Then* $V(\Pi)$ *is a non-split extension of* ω^m *by* ω^{m+1}, *which is "peu ramifiée" if* $[\tau] = (0 : 1)$ *and "très ramifiée" otherwise.*

7.3.5. *A special extension.* The representation $\pi(0, 1, 1)$ is a non-split extension of 1 by St. We want to know to which $\tau \in H$ it corresponds. We begin by giving a description of this representation in the spirit of [BL95, §3.2].

Let $\mathcal{T}$ be the Bruhat-Tits building of $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Q}_p)$. It is a tree with vertices corresponding to homothety classes of lattices in $\mathbb{Q}_p^2$. Two lattices Λ and Λ' are neighbours if and only if, up to homothety, $\Lambda \subset \Lambda'$ and $\Lambda'/\Lambda = \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$. Let us fix a basis (e_1, e_2) of $\mathbb{Q}_p^2$. Let v_0 be the class of the lattice $\Lambda_0 = \mathbb{Z}_p e_1 \oplus \mathbb{Z}_p e_2$ and let v_n be the class of the lattice $\Lambda_n = p^n \mathbb{Z}_p e_1 \oplus \mathbb{Z}_p e_2$, for $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. The group G naturally acts on $\mathcal{T}$ by its action on lattices. The vertices are indexed by $KZ\backslash G$ where the class KZg corresponds to the lattice $g^{-1}v_0$.

Let γ be the geodesic path in $\mathcal{T}$ that links the $(v_n)_{n\in\mathbb{Z}}$. Let Δ be the set of vertices of $\mathcal{T}$. We define a function δ on Δ as follows. Let $v \in \Delta$ and let γ_v be the unique geodesic path from v_0 to v in $\mathcal{T}$. At first γ_v is contained in γ, then eventually leaves it if $v \notin \gamma$. We set $\delta(v) = n$ where n is the last integer such that v_n is on γ_v.

Let $i : \mathbb{Q}_p^\times \to A \subset G$ be as in Section 7.3.2.

Lemma 7.13. *For all $v \in \Delta$ and for all $a \in \mathbb{Z}_p^\times$, $\delta(i(a)v) = \delta(v)$ and $\delta(i(p)v) = \delta(v) + 1$.*

Proof. If $a \in \mathbb{Z}_p^\times$, then $i(a)v_n = v_n$ for all n, and $i(p)v_n = v_{n+1}$. So this is clear when v is on γ.

Suppose $v \in \Delta$ is not on γ, and let γ_v be the path from v_0 to v. The vertices on this path are $v_0, \dots, v_n, v', \dots, v$ where $n = \delta(v)$ and v' is not on γ. For $g \in G$, $g\gamma_v$ is the path from gv_0 to gv.

For $a \in \mathbb{Z}_p^\times$, the vertices on $i(a)\gamma_v$ are $v_0, \dots, v_n, i(a)v', \dots, i(a)v$ with $i(a)v'$ not on γ, so $\delta(i(a)v) = \delta(v)$. The vertices on $i(p)\gamma_v$ are $v_1, \dots, v_{n+1}, i(p)v', \dots, i(p)v$ with $i(p)v'$ not on γ. If $n \geq 0$ then the path from v_0 to $i(p)v$ is the path going from v_0 to v_1, followed by $i(p)\gamma_v$. If $n < 0$ then the path from v_0 to $i(p)v$ is the path obtained by removing the first step of $i(p)\gamma_v$. In both cases, we see that $\delta(i(p)v) = \delta(v) + 1$. □

Let $I = \mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G V_0$. Then I can be identified with the G-representation $k_E^{(\Delta)}$ of functions with values in k_E and finite support in Δ. The Hecke operator acts on $f \in I$ via: $(Tf)(v) = \sum_{d(v,w)=1} f(w)$. The algebraic dual representation $I^\vee$ of I is the representation k_E^Δ, the set of functions on Δ with values in k_E. Let $Q = I/(T-1)$, so that Q is the representation $\pi(0,1,1)$. Then $Q^\vee \subset I^\vee$ is the set of harmonic functions on Δ: $Q^\vee = \{f \in k_E^\Delta, f(v) = \sum_{d(w,v)=1} f(w)\}$.

There is a special element in $I^\vee$ which is the degree function deg given by $\deg(v) = 1$ for all $v \in \Delta$. This function is in fact in $Q^\vee$ as each vertex of Δ has $p+1$ neighbours. It follows from [BL95, Lem. 30] that the kernel of deg inside Q is the representation St, and in particular $\mathrm{St}^\vee$ is $Q^\vee/\deg$.

Let $\mu \in I^\vee$ be defined by $\mu(v) = \delta(v) \in k_E$ for all $v \in \Delta$. Then μ is in fact in $Q^\vee$ as δ is harmonic. Its image μ' in $\mathrm{St}^\vee$ is invariant under the action of A: indeed it follows from Lemma 7.13 that $\mu \circ i(a) = \mu + v_p(a)\deg$ so $\mu' \circ i(a) = \mu'$, for all $a \in \mathbb{Q}_p^\times$. By the results of Section 7.3.3, we can use this linear form to compute the value of τ (we can take for e the characteristic function of any vertex $v \in \Delta$). It follows from Lemma 7.13 that $\tau(\mathbb{Z}_p^\times) = 0$ and $\tau(p) = 1$.

Proposition 7.14. *The representation $Q = \pi(0,1,1)$ is isomorphic to the representation E_τ, for $\tau \in H$ defined by $\tau(\mathbb{Z}_p^\times) = 0$ and $\tau(p) = 1$, that is, $[\tau] = (0 : 1)$.*

7.3.6. *A preliminary lemma.* The proof of this lemma is similar to that of Lemma 3.2 in [BG09]:

Lemma 7.15. *Let F be a quotient of $\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G V_0$, with $F^{ss} \cong \mathrm{St} \oplus 1$. Then $F \cong \pi(0,1,1)$.*

Proof. Let $I = \mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G V_0$ and let $\alpha : I \to F$ be a surjection. The Steinberg representation St is known not to be a quotient of I. Thus any map $\alpha' : I \to F$ must be either the 0-map or surjective, since if the image were the trivial representation 1, then F would have St as a quotient, hence so also would I, by pre-composing with α.

Fix a surjection $\pi : F \to Q$, where $Q \in \{1, \mathrm{St}\}$ is an irreducible quotient of F, so that $Q' := \ker(\pi)$ is also irreducible. Then $f = \pi \circ \alpha$ is also surjective and so $0 \neq f \in \mathrm{Hom}_G(I, Q)$. The finite-dimensional subspace generated by f carries a right action of the Hecke algebra via its action on I and the Hecke operator T has an eigenvalue (over $\bar{\mathbb{F}}_p$) (see also [BL94, Proposition 32] or [Bre03a, Théorème 2.7.1 (i)]). The only eigenvalue that can occur for the action of the Hecke operator T is $\lambda = 1$ (which lies in $k_E = R/\mathfrak{m}_E$), since Q is not a quotient of $\pi(0, \lambda, 1)$ for any other λ. Let f' be the corresponding eigenvector and write $f' = f \circ P(T)$, for some polynomial $P(T)$. Then $f' = 0$ on the image of $T - 1$ in I. Let $\alpha' = \alpha \circ P(T)$. Clearly $\alpha' \neq 0$, since $\pi \circ \alpha' = f' \neq 0$. By what we have said above, α' must be surjective.

Consider now the map $\alpha' \circ (T - 1)$: its image is contained in Q', as $\pi \circ \alpha' \circ (T - 1) = 0$. As Q' is properly contained in F, $\alpha' \circ (T - 1)$ must be the zero map. Thus α' factors through $\pi(0, 1, 1)$, so F is a quotient of $\pi(0, 1, 1)$. But F has the same JH factors as $\pi(0, 1, 1)$, so $F \cong \pi(0, 1, 1)$. ☐

7.4. **A lemma on changing lattices.** We denote by $R = \mathcal{O}_E$ the ring of integers of the finite extension E of $\mathbb{Q}_p$. The following lemma is very similar to Proposition VII 4.5 of [Col10], but it is important for us that M is allowed to be reducible.

Lemma 7.16. *Let $\Theta \in \mathrm{Rep}_{\mathcal{O}_E}(G)$ and $\Pi = \Theta \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_E} E \in \mathrm{Rep}_E(G)$, with Π irreducible. Suppose that $\bar{\Theta}$ has a subrepresentation M that is indecomposable. Then there exists an $\mathcal{O}_E[G]$-lattice Θ' in Π, commensurable to Θ, such that $\bar{\Theta}'$ is indecomposable and contains M as a subrepresentation.*

Proof. The second paragraph of the proof of Proposition VII 4.5 of [Col10] applies without change, with M playing the role of W_1: note that at this point of the proof the fact that W_1 is irreducible does not play a role anymore, only the fact that it is indecomposable. ☐

Corollary 7.17. *Let $\Theta \subset \hat{\Pi}_{k,a_p}$ be an $R[G]$-lattice commensurable to $\hat{\Theta}_{k,a_p}$. Suppose that $\bar{\Theta}$ is an extension of $\pi(p-3, 1, \omega^{m+1})$ by M, where M is an extension of ω^m by $\mathrm{St} \otimes \omega^m$, for some $m \in \mathbb{Z}$.*

If M is non-split and isomorphic to $E_\tau \otimes \omega^m$ for $[\tau] = (0 : 1)$, then there exists a lattice Θ' commensurable to Θ such that $V(\bar{\Theta}')$ is a non-split, "peu ramifiée" extension of ω^m by ω^{m+1}.

If M is non-split and isomorphic to $E_\tau \otimes \omega^m$ for $[\tau] = (1 : x)$, for some $x \in k_E$, then there exists a lattice Θ' commensurable to Θ such that $V(\bar{\Theta}')$ is a non-split, "très ramifiée" extension of ω^m by ω^{m+1}.

Proof. It suffices to apply Lemma 7.16 to Θ, M and then apply Proposition 7.12. ☐

7.5. **The case $a = p - 1$ and $r \geq 2p - 2$ and p does not divide $r + 1$ and $\overline{\frac{a_p}{p(r+1)}} = \pm 1$.** Let $\varepsilon = \overline{\frac{a_p}{p(r+1)}}$, so that $\varepsilon = \pm 1$.

7.5.1. *Statement.*

Theorem 7.18. *Let $p \geq 5$ and $r \geq 2p - 2$. Suppose $p - 1$ divides r, p does not divide $r + 1$ and $\overline{a_p/p(r+1)} = \pm 1$. Then, there exists a $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{Q}_p)$-stable lattices Θ' in Π_{k,a_p} such that $V(\bar{\Theta}')$ is a non-split, "peu ramifiée" extension of $\mu_{\overline{a_p/p(r+1)}}$ by $\mu_{\overline{a_p/p(r+1)}} \cdot \omega$.*

Moreover, in this case the lattice Θ' can be made entirely explicit.

7.5.2. *Another lattice.* Consider the lattice $\mathcal{V}_r = \mathrm{Sym}^r\bar{\mathbb{Z}}_p^2 + \eta\mathrm{Sym}^{r-(p+1)}\bar{\mathbb{Z}}_p^2$ in $\mathrm{Sym}^r\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_p^2$, where $\eta = \theta/p$. This lattice is stable under the action of K, as for all $\gamma \in K$, we have $\gamma\eta \in \bar{\mathbb{Z}}_p\eta + \mathrm{Sym}^{p+1}\bar{\mathbb{Z}}_p^2$.

Let Θ' be the image of $\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G\mathcal{V}_r$ inside $\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G\mathrm{Sym}^r\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_p^2/((T-a_p)\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G\mathrm{Sym}^r\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_p^2)$ and let $\overline{\Theta}'$ be its reduction modulo $\mathfrak{m}_{\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_p}$. We denote by π' the map $\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G\mathcal{V}_r \to \overline{\Theta}'$, and by $\bar{\pi}'$ the map $\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G\bar{\mathcal{V}}_r \to \overline{\Theta}'$ where $\bar{\mathcal{V}}_r$ is the reduction of $\mathcal{V}_r$ modulo $\mathfrak{m}_{\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_p}$.

Theorem 7.19. *$V(\overline{\Theta}')$ is a non-split, "peu ramifiée" extension of μ_ε by $\mu_\varepsilon\cdot\omega$.*

Proof. This follows from Lemmas 7.24 and 7.25 below, and from Propositions 7.12 and 7.14. □

7.5.3. *Factors of $\bar{\mathcal{V}}_r$.* We define some submodules of $\mathcal{V}_r$. First, let M_1 be the submodule $\mathrm{Sym}^r\bar{\mathbb{Z}}_p^2$ of $\mathcal{V}_r$. Let M_0 be the $\bar{\mathbb{Z}}_p[K]$-submodule generated by X^r inside M_1. Let N be the $\bar{\mathbb{Z}}_p$-submodule $\eta\theta^2\mathrm{Sym}^{r-3(p+1)}\bar{\mathbb{Z}}_p^2$ if $r \geq 3(p+1)$, and $N = 0$ otherwise. Finally, let $M_2 = M_1 + N$.

Lemma 7.20. *The submodules M_0, M_1 and M_2 are stable under the action of K.*

Proof. For M_0 and M_1, this is clear from the definition. For M_2, this follows from the argument used to show that $\mathcal{V}_r$ is stable under the action of K. □

Let $\bar{M}_0$, $\bar{M}_1$, $\bar{N}$ and $\bar{M}_2$ be the images in $\bar{\mathcal{V}}_r$ of M_0, M_1, N and M_2 respectively. Hence we get a filtration:

$$0 \subset \bar{M}_0 \subset \bar{M}_1 \subset \bar{M}_2 \subset \bar{\mathcal{V}}_r.$$

Lemma 7.21. *$\bar{M}_1$ is isomorphic as a K-representation to V_r/V_r^*. In this isomorphism, $\bar{M}_0$ corresponds to the submodule generated by X_r. In particular, $\bar{M}_0$ is isomorphic to V_{p-1} and $\bar{M}_1/\bar{M}_0$ is isomorphic to V_0. Moreover, a basis of $\bar{M}_1$ is given by the images of the elements X^r and X^iY^{r-i}, for $0 \leq i \leq p-1$, and a basis of $\bar{M}_0$ is given by the images of the elements X^r and X^iY^{r-i}, for $0 \leq i \leq p-2$.*

Proof. $\bar{M}_1$ is the image in $\bar{\mathcal{V}}_r$ of M_1, hence is a quotient of V_r. To see which quotient, we must compute $(\mathfrak{m}_{\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_p}\mathcal{V}_r) \cap M_1$. As a $\bar{\mathbb{Z}}_p$-module, $\mathcal{V}_r$ has a decomposition $\bar{\mathbb{Z}}_pX^r \oplus (\oplus_{i=0}^{p-1}\bar{\mathbb{Z}}_pX^iY^{r-i}) \oplus S$ where $S = \eta\mathrm{Sym}^{r-(p+1)}\bar{\mathbb{Z}}_p^2$. In this decomposition, $M_1 = \bar{\mathbb{Z}}_pX^r \oplus (\oplus_{i=0}^{p-1}\bar{\mathbb{Z}}_pX^iY^{r-i}) \oplus pS$, and pS is $\theta\mathrm{Sym}^{r-(p+1)}\bar{\mathbb{Z}}_p^2$. Hence $(\mathfrak{m}_{\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_p}\mathcal{V}_r) \cap M_1 = \mathfrak{m}_{\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_p}X^r \oplus (\oplus_{i=0}^{p-1}\mathfrak{m}_{\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_p}X^iY^{r-i}) \oplus pS$. So finally, $\bar{M}_1$ is isomorphic to V_r/V_r^*. The reasoning for M_0 is similar. □

Lemma 7.22. *The Jordan-Hölder factors of $\bar{\mathcal{V}}_r/\bar{M}_2$ are contained in the set $\{V_{p-5}\otimes D^2, V_4\otimes D^{p-3}, V_{p-3}\otimes D, V_2\otimes D^{p-2}\}$.*

Proof. In the notation of the previous lemma, $\bar{\mathcal{V}}_r/\bar{M}_1$ is isomorphic to $S/\mathfrak{m}_{\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_p}S$, that is, $\theta V_{r-(p+1)}$.

Suppose $r \geq 3(p+1)$. Then the submodule $\theta^3V_{r-3(p+1)}$ corresponds to the image of $\bar{N}$ under this isomorphism, hence $\bar{\mathcal{V}}_r/\bar{M}_2 \cong \theta V_{r-(p+1)}/\theta^3V_{r-3(p+1)}$, whose JH factors comprise the set stated in the lemma.

Suppose $r < 3(p+1)$. Then $r = 2p-2$, $r = 3p-3$ or $p = 5$ and $r = 16$, as $p-1$ divides r. If $r = 2p-2$, then $\bar{M}_1 = \bar{M}_2$ and $\bar{\mathcal{V}}_r/\bar{M}_2$ is isomorphic to $V_{p-3} \otimes D$. If $r = 3p-3$, then $\bar{M}_1 = \bar{M}_2$ and the JH factors of $\bar{\mathcal{V}}_r/\bar{M}_2$ are given by the set $\{V_{p-5} \otimes D^2,\ V_{p-3} \otimes D,\ V_2 \otimes D^{p-2}\}$. If $p = 5$ and $r = 16$, then $\bar{M}_1 = \bar{M}_2$, and the JH factors of $\bar{\mathcal{V}}_{16}/\bar{M}_2$ are given by the set $\{V_4 \otimes D^2,\ V_2 \otimes D,\ V_2 \otimes D^3\}$. ☐

7.5.4. *Study of* π'.

Proposition 7.23. *We have:*

(1) *For all* $F \in \mathrm{Sym}^{r-3(p+1)}\bar{\mathbb{Z}}_p^2$, *and all* $g \in G$, *we have* $\pi'([g, \eta\theta^2 F]) = 0$.

(2) $\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G M_0 \subset \ker \pi'$.

Proof. For (1), given $F \in \mathrm{Sym}^{r-3(p+1)}\bar{\mathbb{Z}}_p^2$, consider $f = -(1/a_p)[g, \eta\theta^2 F]$. Then the computation of $(T - a_p)f$ shows that the image of $[g, \eta\theta^2 F]$ in $\bar{\Theta}'$ is zero. For (2), consider $f = [\mathrm{Id}, (\theta/X)Y^{r-p}]$. ☐

We already know from the computations in Section 4 with the lattice Θ which is the image of $\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G \mathrm{Sym}^r \bar{\mathbb{Z}}_p^2$ that, for $r > 2p$, the JH factors that appear in $\overline{\Theta}'$ are μ_ε, $\mathrm{St} \otimes \mu_\varepsilon$ and $\pi(p-3, \varepsilon, \omega)$ (see, in particular, Proposition 4.4). This is also true for $r = 2p-2$, by [Bre03b, Thm. 1.4].

By Proposition 7.23 (1), the images in $\overline{\Theta}'$ of $\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G \bar{M}_1$ and $\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G \bar{M}_2$ are the same. Hence all the JH factors of $\overline{\Theta}'$ are subquotients of $\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G \bar{M}_1$ or of $\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G (\bar{\mathcal{V}}_r/\bar{M}_2)$.

Using Lemma 7.21 and $p > 3$ we see that the JH factor $\pi(p-3, \varepsilon, \omega)$ appears as a subquotient of $\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G (\bar{\mathcal{V}}_r/\bar{M}_2)$. The JH factors μ_ε and $\mathrm{St} \otimes \mu_\varepsilon$ can only appear as quotients of $\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G V_0$ or $\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G V_{p-1}$, hence by Lemma 7.22, we see that these factors can only appear as subquotients of $\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G \bar{M}_1$. Moreover, by Proposition 7.23 (2), the image of $\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G \bar{M}_0$ in $\bar{\Theta}'$ is zero. Hence both factors μ_ε and $\mathrm{St} \otimes \mu_\varepsilon$ appear as subquotients of $\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G (\bar{M}_1/\bar{M}_0) \cong \mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G V_0$. The only possibility is then that the image of $\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G (\bar{M}_1/\bar{M}_0)$ in $\bar{\Theta}'$ is isomorphic to $\pi(0, \varepsilon, 1)$, as the only quotient of $\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G V_0$ that has both these JH factors is $\pi(0, \varepsilon, 1)$ (cf. Lemma 7.15 above). Hence $\pi(0, \varepsilon, 1)$ is a subrepresentation of $\overline{\Theta}'$.

We deduce from this:

Lemma 7.24. *There is an extension:* $0 \to \pi(0, \varepsilon, 1) \to \overline{\Theta}' \to \pi(p-3, \varepsilon, \omega) \to 0$.

7.5.5. *Study of the extension.*

Lemma 7.25. *The extension in Lemma 7.24 does not split.*

Proof. Suppose that the extension is split. Then there exists a G-equivariant projection $\overline{\Theta}' \to \pi(0, \varepsilon, 1)$. As $\pi(0, \varepsilon, 1)$ has a quotient $\chi = \mu_\varepsilon \circ \det$ which is of dimension 1, there exists a G-equivariant non-zero map $\overline{\Theta}' \to \chi$. By composing with $\bar{\pi}'$ we get a non-zero map $\phi : \mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G \bar{\mathcal{V}}_r \to \chi$. Moreover, the restriction of ϕ to $\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G \bar{M}_1$ is still non-zero as $\pi(0, \varepsilon, 1)$ is the image of $\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G \bar{M}_1$ by $\bar{\pi}'$. But the restriction of ϕ to $\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G \bar{M}_0$ is zero, as the image of $\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G \bar{M}_0$ inside $\bar{\Theta}'$ is zero.

Denote by z the image of ηY^{r-p-1} in $\bar{\mathcal{V}}_r$. We have $\phi([\mathrm{Id}, \left(\begin{smallmatrix}1&0\\1&1\end{smallmatrix}\right) z]) = \left(\begin{smallmatrix}1&0\\1&1\end{smallmatrix}\right) \phi([\mathrm{Id}, z]) = \phi([\mathrm{Id}, z])$, as $\det \left(\begin{smallmatrix}1&0\\1&1\end{smallmatrix}\right) = 1$. Let us compute $\left(\begin{smallmatrix}1&0\\1&1\end{smallmatrix}\right) z$. By computing in $\mathcal{V}_r$ and reducing modulo $\mathfrak{m}_{\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_p}$, we see that

$\left(\begin{smallmatrix}1&0\\1&1\end{smallmatrix}\right) z = z+\sum_{i=1}^{p-1} \delta_i X^i Y^{r-i}$ where $\delta_i = \binom{p}{i}/p$, for $1 \leq i \leq p-1$. Hence $\sum_{i=1}^{p-1} \delta_i \phi([\mathrm{Id}, X^i Y^{r-i}]) = 0$. For $1 \leq i \leq p-2$, the image of $X^i Y^{r-i}$ inside $\bar{\mathcal{V}}_r$ is in $\bar{M}_0$ (see Lemma 7.21). Hence $\phi([\mathrm{Id}, X^i Y^{r-i}]) = 0$, for $1 \leq i \leq p-2$. The previous equality reduces to $\delta_{p-1}\phi([\mathrm{Id}, X^{p-1}Y^{r-p+1}]) = 0$. Hence $\phi([\mathrm{Id}, X^{p-1}Y^{r-p+1}]) = 0$. But $X^{p-1}Y^{r-p+1}$ generates $\bar{M}_1/\bar{M}_0$ as a K-representation so we deduce that the restriction of ϕ to $\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^{G}\bar{M}_1$ is zero.

We arrive at a contradiction, hence the extension is in fact not split. □

Remark 7.26. It follows from Lemma 7.24, Corollary 7.17 and Proposition 7.14 that the reduction $\bar{V}_{k,a_p}$ is "peu ramifiée", at least if $\varepsilon = 1$, for some lattice whose reduction is non-split, even without knowing that $\bar{\Theta}'$ is non-split (Lemma 7.25). However, checking that $\bar{\Theta}'$ is non-split allows us to give an explicit lattice Θ' satisfying the conditions of Theorem 7.18.

7.6. The case $a = 2$ and a_p is close to $\varepsilon pr/2$ and r is not $2/3 \mod p$.

Let $E = \mathbb{Q}_p(a_p)$, let $R = \mathcal{O}_E$ and let $\mathfrak{m}_E$ be its maximal ideal, with uniformizer ϖ.

7.6.1. *Statement.*

Theorem 7.27. *Let $p \geq 5$ and $r \geq p+1$. Suppose that $r \equiv 2 \mod (p-1)$, $r \not\equiv 2/3 \mod p$, and that a_p is close to $\varepsilon pr/2$, for $\varepsilon \in \{\pm 1\}$. Then there is a lattice Θ' in $\hat{\Pi}_{k,a_p}$ such that $V(\bar{\Theta}')$ is a "peu ramifiée" extension of $\mu_\varepsilon \cdot \omega$ by $\mu_\varepsilon \cdot \omega^2$.*

Note that the condition that a_p is close to $\varepsilon pr/2$ implies that $\overline{a_p/p} \neq \overline{\varepsilon(1-r)}$, as $r \not\equiv 2/3 \mod p$. It also implies that $r \not\equiv 0 \mod p$.

7.6.2. *The case $r = p+1$.* Let us begin with the case $r = p+1$. The semisimplification of the reduction modulo p of V_{k,a_p} is already known in this case by [Bre03b], [Ber10], and is $\bar{V}_{k,a_p}^{ss} \cong \mu_\lambda \omega^2 \oplus \mu_{\lambda^{-1}}\omega$, with $\lambda = \overline{2a_p/p} \in \bar{\mathbb{F}}_p^\times$. The distinction between "peu ramifiée" and "très ramifiée" was also studied in an unpublished paper of Berger-Breuil [BB] using (φ, Γ)-modules (see also [Vie12] for a more general result). We give a proof using our methods as this is the smallest weight for which the distinction between "peu ramifiée" and "très ramifiée" arises when $v(a_p) = 1$. We keep the same notation as in Section 6.

Proposition 7.28. *Let $\lambda = \overline{2a_p/p}$. Then $F_0 = 0$, F_1 is a quotient of $\pi(0, \lambda, \omega)$ and F_2 is a quotient of $\pi(p-3, \lambda^{-1}, \omega^2)$.*

Proof. As mentioned, this was computed by Breuil in [Bre03b]. We sketch a proof by the methods used in Section 6, but the computation is simpler for $r = p+1$ than what done there. For F_0, we already have $J_0 = 0$ in the filtration of P, for $r = p+1$. For F_1, compute $(T - a_p)[\mathrm{Id}, (1/p)\theta]$ and observe that $\theta \equiv 2X^pY \equiv -2XY^p \mod X_{p+1}$. For F_2, compute $(T-a_p)(\sum_\lambda [g_{1,[\lambda]}^0, (1/p)(X^{p-1}Y^2 - Y^{p+1}])$. □

Corollary 7.29. *$\bar{\Theta}_{p+3,a_p}$ is an extension of $\pi(p-3, \lambda^{-1}, \omega^2)$ by $\pi(0, \lambda, \omega)$ and $\bar{V}_{p+3,a_p}^{ss} \simeq \mu_\lambda \cdot \omega^2 \oplus \mu_{\lambda^{-1}} \cdot \omega$, for $\lambda = \overline{2a_p/p}$.*

Theorem 7.30. *Let $p \geq 5$ and $r = p+1$. Suppose that $\overline{a_p/p} = \pm 1/2$, so that $\lambda = \pm 1$. Then there exists a lattice Θ' in $\hat{\Pi}_{p+3,a_p}$ such that $V(\bar{\Theta}')$ is a "peu ramifiée" extension of $\mu_{\lambda^{-1}} \cdot \omega$ by $\mu_\lambda \cdot \omega^2$.*

Proof. By twisting, we may assume $\lambda = 1$. The theorem then follows from Corollary 7.17 and Proposition 7.14. ☐

7.6.3. *The case $r > p+1$.* Now we will generalize the theorem above to the cases $r > p+1$. For simplicity, we shall assume $\overline{a_p/p} = +r/2 \in k_E$ since the proof in the case $\overline{a_p/p} = -r/2$ is identical. Recall that the conditions $v(a_p) = 1$ and $\overline{a_p/p} = r/2$ together imply that $r \not\equiv 0 \mod p$.

Recall that when $a = 2$, the submodule $W_1 \cong V_r^*/V_r^{**} = J_0 \oplus J_1 \subset P$, where $J_0 = V_{p-1} \otimes D$ and $J_1 = V_0 \otimes D$. The image of $\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G W_1$ in $\bar{\Theta}_{k,a_p}$ was denoted by U_1.

Let F_1' be the image in U_1 of the submodule $\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G J_1$ of $\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G W_1$. Then $F_0' := U_1/F_1'$ is a quotient of $\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G J_0$ and we have a diagram similar to Diagram (3.2):

(7.1)
$$\begin{tikzcd}
0 \arrow[r] & \mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G J_1 \arrow[r] \arrow[d, two heads] & \mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G W_1 \arrow[r] \arrow[d, two heads] & \mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G J_0 \arrow[r] \arrow[d, two heads] & 0 \\
0 \arrow[r] & F_1' \arrow[r] & U_1 \arrow[r] & F_0' \arrow[r] & 0.
\end{tikzcd}$$

Proposition 7.31. *Suppose that $r \equiv 2 \mod (p-1)$ and that $v(a_p^2 - \binom{r}{2}p^2) = 2 + v(r-2)$. Let $\lambda \in \bar{\mathbb{F}}_p^\times$ be the reduction mod p of $\frac{2(a_p^2 - \binom{r}{2}p^2)}{pa_p(2-r)}$. Suppose that $\overline{a_p/p}$ is not equal to $\lambda\overline{(1-r)}$. Then $F_0' = 0$.*

Note that $F_0 \neq 0$, by Remark 6.8, so F_0 and F_0' do not always coincide, although each occurs as a common factor in both $\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G J_0$ and U_1.

In order to prove the proposition, we need a few lemmas.

Lemma 7.32. *Let $p \geq 3$, $r \geq 2p$, with $r \equiv 2 \mod (p-1)$. Then the image of $F(X,Y) = X^{r-1}Y + \frac{r}{2} \cdot \theta X^{r-2p}Y^{p-1} - \frac{r}{2} \cdot \theta Y^{r-p-1}$ in P lands in $W_0 (\cong J_0 \subset P)$ and it maps to $\frac{2-r}{2} \cdot X^{p-1} \in J_0$.*

Proof. Using Lemma 3.4 and Lemma 6.5 (i), we get that $F(X,Y)$ maps to $0 \in J_2$, and it maps to $-\frac{r}{2} + \frac{r}{2} + 0 = 0 \in J_1$. Therefore its image in P lands in W_0, as claimed. To find its image in $J_0 = V_{p-1} \otimes D$, we rewrite $F(X,Y)$ modulo $X_r + V_r^{**}$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
F(X,Y) &\equiv X^{r-1}Y + \frac{r}{2} \cdot \theta X^{r-2p}Y^{p-1} - \frac{r}{2} \cdot \theta Y^{r-p-1} + \frac{1}{2} \cdot \sum_{k \in \mathbb{F}_p} k^{p-2}(kX+Y)^r \mod X_r \\
&\equiv \frac{r}{2} \cdot \theta X^{r-2p}Y^{p-1} - \frac{r}{2} \cdot \theta Y^{r-p-1} + X^{r-1}Y - \frac{1}{2} \cdot \sum_{\substack{0 \leq j \leq r \\ j \equiv 1 \mod (p-1)}} \binom{r}{j} X^{r-j}Y^j \mod p.
\end{aligned}$$

The last polynomial is divisible by θ, since, by Lemma 2.3 (i), the sum of its coefficients is 0. Writing it as an element in $\theta V_{r-p-1} = V_r^*$, we must have

$$F(X,Y) \equiv \theta \cdot \left(\left(-\frac{r}{2} + \frac{r}{2} \right) Y^{r-p-1} + \left(1 - \frac{r}{2} \right) X^{r-p-1} + c \cdot X^{r-2p}Y^{p-1} \right) \mod X_r + V_r^{**},$$

for some $c \in \mathbb{F}_p$. We already know that $F(X,Y)$ maps to $0 \in J_1$, so $c = 0 \in \mathbb{F}_p$, by Lemma 3.4 (ii). Now the result follows by Lemma 3.4 (i) applied to the right hand side of the congruence above. $\square$

Lemma 7.33. *For $r > 2p$, the projection $\mathrm{Pr} : W_1 \cong V_r^*/V_r^{**} \twoheadrightarrow J_0 = V_{p-1} \otimes D$ takes the polynomials θX^s, θY^s and $\theta X^{r-2p} Y^{p-1}$ to X^{p-1}, Y^{p-1} and $X^{p-1} + Y^{p-1}$ respectively, where $s = r - p - 1$. Moreover, the image of $X^{r-1}Y$ in P lands in W_1 and it projects to $(1-r) \cdot X^{p-1} \in J_0$.*

Proof. The image of θX^s is X^{p-1}, Lemma 3.4 (i). The image of θY^s is then obtained by applying the matrix $w = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{smallmatrix}\right)$ to it and by using Γ-linearity of Pr. The image of $\theta X^{r-2p} Y^{p-1}$ under Pr can be calculated using the action of w, the diagonal matrices and the unipotent matrices of Γ, on the polynomial $\theta X^{r-2p} Y^{p-1}$, and is left as an exercise.

The polynomial $H(X,Y) := X^{r-1}Y + \dfrac{r}{2} \cdot \theta X^{r-2p} Y^{p-1} - \dfrac{r}{2} \cdot \theta Y^s - \dfrac{2-r}{2} \cdot \theta X^s \in V_r$ maps to 0 in P, by Lemma 7.32 and Lemma 3.4 (i). Therefore using the previous calculations we obtain

$$\mathrm{Pr}(X^{r-1}Y) = -\frac{r}{2} \cdot (X^{p-1} + Y^{p-1}) + \frac{r}{2} \cdot Y^{p-1} + \frac{2-r}{2} \cdot X^{p-1} = (1-r) \cdot X^{p-1}.$$

$\square$

Proof of Proposition 7.31. We consider the function $f = \left[\mathrm{Id},\, \frac{1}{p} \cdot \theta X^s\right] \in \mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G \mathrm{Sym}^r \bar{\mathbb{Q}}_p^2$ and compute that $(T - a_p)f$ is integral and reduces to $-\left[\mathrm{Id},\, \frac{a_p}{p} \cdot \theta X^s\right] + \sum\limits_{\lambda \in \mathbb{F}_p} \left[g_{1,[\lambda]}^0,\, X^{r-1}Y\right] \mod p$, which further maps to $-\left[\mathrm{Id},\, \frac{a_p}{p} \cdot X^{p-1}\right] + \sum\limits_{\lambda \in \mathbb{F}_p} \left[g_{1,[\lambda]}^0,\, (1-r) \cdot X^{p-1}\right]$ in $\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G J_0$, by Lemma 7.33.

This shows that $F_0' = 0$, when $r \equiv 1 \mod p$. Suppose now that $r \not\equiv 1 \mod p$. Then F_0' is a quotient of $\pi(p-1, \frac{a_p}{p(1-r)}, \omega)$. It follows from the proof of Theorem 6.1 (i) that the JH factors of U_1 are the same as the JH factors of $\pi(p-1, \lambda, \omega)$. But we have assumed that λ is not equal to the reduction mod p of $\frac{a_p}{p(1-r)}$, so $\pi(p-1, \lambda, \omega)$ and $\pi(p-1, \overline{\frac{a_p}{p(1-r)}}, \omega)$ have no common JH factor. So $F_0' = 0$. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 7.27. Consider the subrepresentation U_1 of $\bar{\Theta}_{k,a_p}$. Its JH factors are those of $\pi(p-1, 1, \omega)$, that is ω and $\mathrm{St} \circ \omega$. Consider its subrepresentation F_1' and quotient $F_0' = U_1/F_1'$ as above. We are in a situation where Proposition 7.31 applies, as we remarked after the statement of Theorem 7.27. So $U_1 = F_1'$ is a quotient of $\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G(V_0 \otimes D)$. This forces U_1 to be $\pi(0, 1, \omega)$, by Lemma 7.15. The theorem now follows from Corollary 7.17 and Proposition 7.14, since $\bar{\Theta}_{k,a_p}$ is an extension of $\pi(p-3, 1, \omega^2)$ by U_1. $\square$

7.7. The case $a = 2$ and $r \geq 2p$ and a_p is close to $\varepsilon p(1-r)$ and r is not $2/3$ modulo p.

Let $E = \mathbb{Q}_p(a_p)$, let $R = \mathcal{O}_E$ and let $\mathfrak{m}_E$ be its maximal ideal, with uniformizer ϖ.

7.7.1. *Statement.*

Theorem 7.34. *Let $p \geq 5$ and $r \geq 2p$. Suppose that $r \equiv 2 \mod (p-1)$, $r \not\equiv 2/3$ modulo p, and that a_p is close to $\varepsilon p(1-r)$, for $\varepsilon \in \{\pm\}$. Let $u = u(a_p) = \frac{2(a_p^2 - \binom{r}{2}p^2)}{pa_p(2-r)}$. If $r \equiv 2 \mod p$, assume further that either E is unramified over $\mathbb{Q}_p$ or $u - \varepsilon$ is a uniformizer of E.*

(1) *If* $v(u-\varepsilon) < 1$*, then there exists a lattice* Θ' *in* $\hat{\Pi}_{k,a_p}$ *such that* $V(\bar{\Theta}')$ *is a "peu ramifiée" extension of* $\mu_\varepsilon \cdot \omega$ *by* $\mu_\varepsilon \cdot \omega^2$*.*

(2) *If* $v(u-\varepsilon) \geq 1$*, then there exists a lattice* Θ' *in* $\hat{\Pi}_{k,a_p}$ *such that* $V(\bar{\Theta}')$ *is a "très ramifiée" extension of* $\mu_\varepsilon \cdot \omega$ *by* $\mu_\varepsilon \cdot \omega^2$*.*

(3) *Moreover, for a fixed* $r \not\equiv 1 \mod p$*, all isomorphism classes of "très ramifiée" extensions appear depending on the choice of* a_p*.*

Note that the condition that a_p is close to $\varepsilon p(1-r)$ implies that $\overline{u(a_p)} = \bar{\varepsilon} \neq \overline{rp/2a_p}$, as $r \not\equiv 2/3 \mod p$. It also implies $r \not\equiv 1 \mod p$.

Under the conditions of the theorem, we have that $F_1 = 0$, by the following proposition.

Proposition 7.35. *Suppose that* $v(a_p^2 - \binom{r}{2}p^2) = 2 + v(r-2)$*. If* $\lambda = \overline{\frac{2(a_p^2 - \binom{r}{2}p^2)}{pa_p(2-r)}} \neq \overline{rp/2a_p}$*, then* $F_1 = 0$*.*

Proof. Recall that F_1 is a proper quotient of $\pi(0, \overline{rp/2a_p}, \omega)$, by Proposition 6.6, and we can assume that p does not divide r.

If $\overline{rp/2a_p} \neq \pm 1$, then $\pi(0, \overline{rp/2a_p}, \omega)$ is irreducible, and so $F_1 = 0$.

In general (allowing $\overline{rp/2a_p}$ to be ± 1), by the mod p LLC, we know that the JH factors of F_0, F_1 and F_2 are contained in the JH factors of $\pi(p-1, \lambda, \omega)$ and $\pi(p-3, \lambda^{-1}, \omega^2)$. As $\lambda \neq \overline{rp/2a_p}$, the JH factors of $\pi(0, \overline{rp/2a_p}, \omega)$ are not contained in this set and so $F_1 = 0$. □

Remark 7.36. The final paragraph of the proof of Proposition 7.35 does not make any distinction between whether $\overline{rp/2a_p} = \pm 1$ or not. However, it will be useful later to know that if $\overline{rp/2a_p} \neq \pm 1$, then we can prove $F_1 = 0$ without using the mod p LLC and solely by computing explicit elements in the kernel of the map $\operatorname{ind}_{KZ}^G V_r \to \bar{\Theta}_{k,a_p}$; see Remark 7.42. This is why we have separately mentioned the proof given in the second paragraph above.

For the rest of this section, fix a_p, r and $u = u(a_p)$, as in the hypotheses of Theorem 7.34. We suppose also that $\varepsilon = 1$ (and so $\overline{a_p/p} = 1 - r$) to simplify notation, since the proof in the case that $\varepsilon = -1$ is identical.

We define an element $\delta \in R$ as follows:

$$\delta = \begin{cases} u-1 & \text{if } v(u-1) < 1, \\ p & \text{if } v(u-1) \geq 1. \end{cases}$$

Note that δ is a uniformizer of E if and only if either $u-1$ is a uniformizer of E or E is unramified.

7.7.2. *Comparing lattices for different values of* a_p*.* In this subsection (and only in this subsection), we make the assumption that $r \not\equiv 2 \mod p$.

Let $\Lambda = \operatorname{ind}_{KZ}^G \operatorname{Sym}^r R^2$. Let Θ be the standard lattice for a_p and let Θ_R^0 be the standard lattice when we take $a_p^0 = p(1-r) \in \mathbb{Z}_p \subset R$ for the value of a_p, thought of as an R-lattice. Then:

Proposition 7.37. $\Theta \otimes_R \frac{R}{(\delta)}$ *and* $\Theta_R^0 \otimes_R \frac{R}{(\delta)}$ *are isomorphic as* $R[G]$*-modules.*

Let $M = (T - a_p)(\Lambda \otimes_R E) \cap \Lambda$ and $M_0 = (T - a_p^0)(\Lambda \otimes_R E) \cap \Lambda$. We have that $\Theta \otimes_R R/(\delta) = \Lambda/(M + \delta\Lambda)$ and $\Theta_R^0 \otimes_R R/(\delta) = \Lambda/(M_0 + \delta\Lambda)$ as representations of G, so to prove Proposition 7.37 it is enough to prove the following result:

Proposition 7.38. $M + \delta\Lambda = M_0 + \delta\Lambda$.

In order to prove this proposition, we introduce the submodule M' of M generated over $R[G]$ by all the functions of the form $(T - a_p)f$ that we used to compute $\bar{V}_{k,a_p}^{ss}$ in the proofs of Propositions 6.7, 6.6 and 6.4. To be more precise, M' is generated by the integral functions $(T - a_p)f$ introduced in the proofs of these propositions, and also the functions f used in [BG09, Rem 4.4] to show that X_r and V_r^{**} do not contribute to $\bar{\Theta}$.

Let M_0' be the analogous $R[G]$-submodule of M_0 generated by the integral functions $(T - a_p^0)f^0$, for the rational functions f^0 as above defined using $a_p^0 = p(1 - r)$. We have:

Lemma 7.39. *$M' + \delta\Lambda = M_0' + \delta\Lambda$.*

Proof. It is enough to show that the various functions $(T - a_p)f$ and $(T - a_p^0)f^0$ used to define M' and M_0' are same modulo $\delta\Lambda$.

The functions $(T - a_p)f$ and $(T - a_p^0)f^0$ used to show that V_r^{**} and X_r do not contribute to $\bar{\Theta}$ and $\bar{\Theta}_R^0$ respectively, are the same even up to $p\Lambda$. Next, the identity

$$u - 1 = \frac{2}{2 - r} \cdot \frac{p}{a_p}\left(\frac{a_p}{p} - \frac{r}{2}\right)\left(\frac{a_p}{p} - (1 - r)\right)$$

implies the equality of valuations $v(u - 1) = v\left(\frac{a_p}{p} - (1 - r)\right)$, as the other factors are units by the hypotheses $v(a_p) = 1$, $r \not\equiv 2 \mod p$ and $\overline{a_p/p} \neq \pm r/2 \in \bar{\mathbb{F}}_p$. Using the definition of δ, it follows that

$$v\left(\frac{a_p}{p} - \frac{a_p^0}{p}\right) = v\left(\frac{p}{a_p} - \frac{p}{a_p^0}\right) = v(u - 1) \geq v(\delta).$$

Using this, one checks case by case that for each of the functions f and f^0 used to define M' and M_0' respectively, the integral functions $(T - a_p)f$ and $(T - a_p^0)f^0$ are the same modulo $\delta\Lambda$. ☐

Remark 7.40. The lemma also holds for $r \equiv 2 \mod p$, since a_p/p is close to $1 - r$ implies that we may replace the inequality above with $v(\frac{a_p}{p} - \frac{a_p^0}{p}) = v(u - 1) + v(2 - r) \geq v(\delta)$.

Lemma 7.41. *$M' + \varpi\Lambda = M + \varpi\Lambda$ and $M_0' + \varpi\Lambda = M_0 + \varpi\Lambda$.*

Proof. Since $M' \subset M$, there is a G-equivariant surjection $\Lambda/(M' + \varpi\Lambda) \to \Lambda/(M + \varpi\Lambda)$. This map is in fact an isomorphism. Indeed, looking back at Section 6, we see that we effectively computed a list of possible JH factors in $\Lambda/(M' + \varpi\Lambda)$, that is, we computed the set $S = \mathrm{JH}(\Lambda/(M' + \varpi\Lambda))$. More precisely, Propositions 6.4, 6.7 and (part of) 7.35 show that $S = \{\omega, \mathrm{St} \otimes \omega, \pi(p - 3, 1, \omega^2)\}$. The surjection above implies that $\mathrm{JH}(\Lambda/(M + \varpi\Lambda)) \subset S$. However, considerations about the mod p LLC show that $\mathrm{JH}(\Lambda/(M + \varpi\Lambda)) = S$, and so we have $\mathrm{JH}(\Lambda/(M' + \varpi\Lambda)) = S = \mathrm{JH}(\Lambda/(M + \varpi\Lambda))$. Hence the kernel of the map above is zero, so $M' + \varpi\Lambda = M + \varpi\Lambda$.

The same reasoning applies to M_0 and M_0'. ☐

Remark 7.42. It is in the proof of this lemma that we use the additional condition $r \not\equiv 2 \mod p$. Indeed, as $r \not\equiv 2/3 \mod p$, we have $\overline{rp/2a_p} \neq \pm 1$ if and only if $r \not\equiv 2 \mod p$, and we can use the second paragraph in the proof of Proposition 7.35 . When $r \equiv 2 \mod p$, $\mathrm{JH}(\Lambda/(M + \varpi\Lambda)) \subset S$, but we do not have equality. Indeed, in this case we have $\overline{\frac{rp}{2a_p}} = \overline{\frac{1}{1-r}} = -1$ and Proposition 7.35 is proved using the mod p LLC and so does not give information about M'. Propositions 6.4, 6.7 and 6.6 do show that the set $S = \mathrm{JH}(\Lambda/(M' + \varpi\Lambda)) = \{\omega, \mathrm{St} \otimes \omega, \omega \otimes \mu_{-1}, \pi(p-3, 1, \omega^2)\}$, as $\lambda = \bar{\varepsilon} = 1$. However, considerations about the image of the mod p LLC show that necessarily $\mathrm{JH}(\Lambda/(M + \varpi\Lambda)) = \{\mathrm{St} \otimes \omega, \omega, \pi(p-3, 1, \omega^2)\} \neq S$.

We now remark that M and M_0 are saturated, that is, if $z \in \Lambda$ is such that $\varpi z \in M$, then $z \in M$.

We then deduce from Lemma 7.43 below, applied to (Λ, M, M') and (Λ, M_0, M_0'), that $M' + \delta\Lambda = M + \delta\Lambda$ and $M_0' + \delta\Lambda = M_0 + \delta\Lambda$, hence $M + \delta\Lambda = M_0 + \delta\Lambda$, which completes the proof of Proposition 7.38.

Lemma 7.43. *Let Λ be a free R-module, $M \subset \Lambda$ a saturated submodule, and $M' \subset M$ a submodule such that $M + \varpi\Lambda = M' + \varpi\Lambda$. Then $M + \varpi^n\Lambda = M' + \varpi^n\Lambda$, for all $n \geq 1$.*

Proof. We reason by induction on n. Suppose that $M + \varpi^n\Lambda = M' + \varpi^n\Lambda$. Let $x \in M$. There exist $y \in M'$ and $z \in \Lambda$ with $x = y + \varpi^n z$. Then $\varpi^n z \in M$, hence $z \in M$, as M is saturated. So there exist $y' \in M'$ and $z' \in \Lambda$, with $z = y' + \varpi z'$. Then $x = (y + \varpi^n y') + \varpi^{n+1} z' \in M' + \varpi^{n+1}\Lambda$. ☐

Note that in the course of proving Proposition 7.38 we have also proved:

Corollary 7.44. *$M + \varpi\Lambda = M_0 + \varpi\Lambda$, and hence $\bar{\Theta}$ is isomorphic to $\bar{\Theta}^0_R$.*

7.7.3. *Study of the standard lattice.* We allow again the case $r \equiv 2 \mod p$.

Let $\Theta = \Theta_{k,a_p} \subset \Pi_{k,a_p}$ be the standard lattice, and let $\hat{\Theta} \subset \hat{\Pi}_{k,a_p}$ be its completion. Let $\Lambda = \mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G \mathrm{Sym}^r R^2$.

As $F_1 = 0$, by Proposition 7.35, we know that $\bar{\Theta}$ is an extension of $\pi(p-3, 1, \omega^2)$ by $\pi(p-1, 1, \omega)$. Hence we have a filtration of $\bar{\Theta}$ with successive quotients ω, $\mathrm{St} \otimes \omega$ and $\pi(p-3, 1, \omega^2)$. We want to lift this filtration to $\hat{\Theta}$.

Let $\Lambda^0 = \mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G \mathrm{Sym}^r \mathbb{Z}_p^2$ and let Θ^0 be the standard lattice defined over $\mathbb{Z}_p$, for $a_p^0 = p(1-r) \in \mathbb{Z}_p$. Thus $\Theta^0_R = \Theta^0 \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}_p} R$. Let $\mathcal{B}_1$ be the set with one element which is the image of $[\mathrm{Id}, \theta X^{r-p-1}] + [\alpha, \theta Y^{r-p-1}]$ in $\bar{\Theta}^0$, so that the line L in $\bar{\Theta}^0$ generated by $\mathcal{B}_1$ is the line on which G acts by ω. Let $\mathcal{B}_2$ be a free family of elements of $\bar{\Theta}^0$ such that $\mathcal{B}_1 \cup \mathcal{B}_2$ generate the subrepresentation $\pi(p-1, 1, \omega)$. Let $\mathcal{B}_3$ be a free family of elements of $\bar{\Theta}^0$ such that $\mathcal{B}_1 \cup \mathcal{B}_2 \cup \mathcal{B}_3$ is a basis of $\bar{\Theta}^0$, and moreover the image of $\mathcal{B}_3$ in $\bar{\Theta}^0/L$ generates the subrepresentation of $\bar{\Theta}^0/L$ isomorphic to $\pi(p-3, 1, \omega^2)$, which is possible as $\bar{\Theta}^0/L$ is a split extension of $\pi(p-3, 1, \omega^2)$ by $\mathrm{St} \otimes \omega$, by Proposition 7.3. We lift each $\mathcal{B}_i$ to a free family $\mathcal{B}_i'$ in Λ^0, taking $\mathcal{B}_1'$ to be the singleton set with the element $[\mathrm{Id}, \theta X^{r-p-1}] + [\alpha, \theta Y^{r-p-1}]$.

For $\hat{\Theta}$ coming from any a_p, we now take S_i to be the closure of the free R-submodule generated by the image of $\mathcal{B}_i'$ inside $\hat{\Theta}$, under the composition of maps $\Lambda^0 \to \Lambda \to \hat{\Theta}$. By construction, we have a decomposition of k_E-vector spaces $\bar{\Theta} \cong (\bar{\Theta}^0 \otimes_{\mathbb{F}_p} k_E) = \bar{S}_1 \oplus \bar{S}_2 \oplus \bar{S}_3$ (the first equality is Corollary

7.44), with $\bar{S}_1 = L \otimes_{\mathbb{F}_p} k_E$ the line on which G acts by ω and $\bar{S}_1 \oplus \bar{S}_2$ is the subrepresentation isomorphic to $\pi(p-1, 1, \omega)$. In particular, $\hat{\Theta} = S_1 \oplus S_2 \oplus S_3$. We set $M_1 = S_1$ and $M_2 = S_1 \oplus S_2$. Let $\bar{M}_i$ be their reductions modulo $\mathfrak{m}_E$, for $i = 1, 2$. The sequence of R-modules $0 \subset M_1 \subset M_2 \subset \hat{\Theta}$ lifts the filtration of $\bar{\Theta}$.

For $1 \leq i, j \leq 3$, we define functions $a_{i,j} : G \to \mathrm{Hom}(S_i, S_j)$ so that, for all $g \in G$ and $x \in S_i$, we have $gx = a_{i,1}(g)(x) + a_{i,2}(g)(x) + a_{i,3}(g)(x)$. If $j > i$, then we have $a_{i,j}(g) \in \mathfrak{m}_E \mathrm{Hom}(S_i, S_j)$, for all $g \in G$. Moreover, by the choice of $\mathcal{B}_3$, we have $a_{3,2}(g) \in \mathfrak{m}_E \mathrm{Hom}(S_3, S_2)$, for all $g \in G$.

Proposition 7.45. *We have:*

(1) $a_{1,2}(g) \in \delta \mathrm{Hom}(S_1, S_2)$, *for all* $g \in G$.

(2) $a_{3,2}(g) \in \delta \mathrm{Hom}(S_3, S_2)$, *for all* $g \in G$.

Proof. If δ is a uniformizer of E, both results follow from the remarks just before the statement of the proposition.

Now suppose that δ is not a uniformizer of E. In particular, by the hypotheses of Theorem 7.34, we have $r \not\equiv 2 \mod p$ and we can use the results from Section 7.7.2.

Let us denote by a superscript 0 all the analogous constructions with $a_p^0 = p(1-r)$. So $E^0 = \mathbb{Q}_p$, $\delta^0 = p$ is a uniformizer of E^0, S_i^0 is the subspace of $\hat{\Theta}^0$ defined as before. Hence we get that $a_{1,2}^0(g) \in p\mathrm{Hom}(S_1^0, S_2^0)$, for all $g \in G$, and $a_{3,2}(g) \in p\mathrm{Hom}(S_3^0, S_2^0)$, for all $g \in G$.

We consider now $\hat{\Theta}_R^0 = \hat{\Theta}^0 \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}_p} R$ and let $S_{i,R}^0$ be the closure of the image of S_i^0 in $\hat{\Theta}_R^0$. Then $S_{i,R}^0$ is the closure of the R-submodule generated by the image of the elements of $\mathcal{B}'_i$ inside $\hat{\Theta}_R^0$.

Then we can also define elements $a_{i,j,R}^0(g) \in \mathrm{Hom}(S_{i,R}^0, S_{j,R}^0)$ which come from the elements $a_{i,j}^0(g) \in \mathrm{Hom}(S_i^0, S_j^0)$ by R-linearity. In particular, $a_{i,j,R}^0(g) \in p\mathrm{Hom}(S_{i,R}^0, S_{j,R}^0)$ if $j = 2$ and $i = 1$ or $i = 3$.

By Proposition 7.37, there is an isomorphism of $R[G]$-modules $\psi : \hat{\Theta}_R^0/(\delta) \to \hat{\Theta}/(\delta)$. By the construction of the submodules S_i of $\hat{\Theta}$, we have that ψ induces an isomorphism between $S_{i,R}^0/(\delta)$ and $S_i/(\delta)$. Indeed, if M and M_0 are as defined just after the statement of Proposition 7.37, then both spaces arise from the R-module generated by the image of the elements in $\mathcal{B}'_i$ in $\Lambda/(M_0 + \delta\Lambda) = \Lambda/(M + \delta\Lambda)$.

In particular, if b' is an element of $\mathcal{B}'_i$, b is its image in $\hat{\Theta}$ and b^0 is its image in $\hat{\Theta}_R^0$, then $a_{i,j}(g)(b)$ modulo δ is the image by ψ of $a_{i,j,R}^0(g)(b^0)$ modulo δ. When $j = 2$ and $i = 1$ or 3, we know that $a_{i,j,R}^0(g)(b^0)$ is in $pS_{j,R}^0$, so it is also in $\delta S_{j,R}^0$, so $a_{i,j,R}^0(g)(b^0) = 0$ modulo δ, so $a_{i,j}(g)(b) = 0$ modulo δ. Thus $a_{1,2}(g)$ and $a_{3,2}(g)$ are the zero functions modulo δ. ☐

7.7.4. *Changing the lattice.* Let $S'_1 = \delta S_2$, $S'_2 = S_1$, $S'_3 = S_3$. Let $\Theta' = S'_1 \oplus S'_2 \oplus S'_3$, so Θ' is complete, and let $M'_1 = S'_1$ and $M'_2 = S'_1 \oplus S'_2$, so that $0 \subset M'_1 \subset M'_2 \subset \Theta'$ is a filtration of R-modules. Note that M'_2 does not depend on the choice of S_2, since $M'_2 = \delta M_2 + S_1$.

Proposition 7.46. *The lattice* Θ' *is stable under the action of* G. *Moreover,* $\bar{\Theta}'$ *has a filtration* $0 \subset \bar{M}'_1 \subset \bar{M}'_2 \subset \bar{\Theta}'$ *with successive JH factors isomorphic to* $\mathrm{St} \otimes \omega$, ω *and* $\pi(p-3, 1, \omega^2)$.

Proof. The first statement follows from Proposition 7.45. Note that M_1' is not G-stable, but that $\bar{M}_1'$ is, since $\bar{M}_1' = \delta S_2/\varpi\delta S_2 \cong \bar{S}_2 = \overline{M_2/M_1} \cong \bar{M}_2/\bar{M}_1 \cong \mathrm{St}\otimes\omega$. Now $M_2'/M_1' \cong S_1 \cong M_1$, so its reduction is $\bar{S}_1 = \omega$. Finally, $\Theta'/M_2' \cong S_3 \cong \Theta/M_2$ and its reduction must be the remaining JH factor $\pi(p-3,1,\omega^2)$. □

Using Corollary 7.17, we now have to study $\bar{M}_2' \subset \bar{\Theta}'$ which is an extension of ω by $\mathrm{St}\otimes\omega$: we must see if it non-split and compute a τ such that it is isomorphic to $E_\tau \otimes \omega$ (note that the fact that it is non-split will follow from the computation of τ).

7.7.5. *Computations in the new lattice.* Let $\Lambda = \mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G \mathrm{Sym}^r R^2$ as before and let $\pi : \Lambda \to \hat{\Pi}_{k,a_p}$, so that $\pi(\Lambda) = \Theta$. We also denote by $\bar{\pi}$ the usual map $\Lambda \to \bar{\Theta}$. If $x \in \Lambda$ satisfies $\pi(x) \in \Theta'$, denote by $\psi(x)$ its image in $\bar{\Theta}'$. Let $N \cong \mathrm{St}\otimes\omega$ be the image of $M_1' = S_1'$, or equivalently of δM_2, in $\bar{\Theta}'$, and let M be the image of M_2' in $\bar{\Theta}'$.

Lemma 7.47. *We have $p^2\Lambda$ and $p\ker\bar{\pi}$ are contained in $\ker\psi$. If $v(\delta) < 1$, then so is $p\Lambda$. Moreover, δS_1 and δS_3 also die in $\bar{\Theta}'$.*

Proof. By the construction of Θ', we have $\pi(\delta\Lambda) = \delta\Theta \subset \Theta'$. So if $t \in R$, with $v(t) > v(\delta)$, then $t\Lambda \subset \ker\psi$. The statement about δS_1 and δS_3 follows from the construction of Θ'. □

In particular:

Lemma 7.48. *Let F, F' be elements of $\mathrm{Sym}^r R^2$ such that the image of $F - F'$ in V_r is in $X_r + V_r^{**}$. Then $\psi([g, pF]) = \psi([g, pF'])$, for all $g \in G$.*

Proof. The hypothesis implies that $[g, F - F'] \in \ker\bar{\pi}$. Now apply the previous lemma. □

Lemma 7.49. *Let $F \in \mathrm{Sym}^r R^2$ be such that its image in V_r lies in $X_r + V_r^{**}$. Then, for all $g \in G$, $[g, F] \in \ker\pi + p\Lambda$. In particular, $\pi([g, F]) \in \Theta'$ and if $v(\delta) < 1$, then $\psi([g, F]) = 0$.*

Proof. This follows from the computations described in [BG09, Rem. 4.4], showing that the map $\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G V_r \to \bar{\Theta}$ factors through $\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G P$. These are recalled in the proof of the next lemma, so we omit the proof. □

Lemma 7.50. *Let $F \in \mathrm{Sym}^r \mathbb{Z}_p^2$ be such that its image in V_r lies in $X_r + V_r^{**}$. Then, for all $g \in G$, $[g, F]$ is in $\ker\psi + p\Lambda^0$. More precisely, there is a $z \in \Lambda^0$, independent of a_p, such that $[g, F] + pz \in \ker\psi$.*

Proof. Let M be the $\mathbb{Z}_p[K]$-submodule of $\mathrm{Sym}^r\mathbb{Z}_p^2$ generated by X^r and $\theta^2\mathrm{Sym}^{r-2(p+1)}\mathbb{Z}_p^2$. Then the reduction of F modulo p lies in $X_r + V_r^{**}$, the image of M in V_r. So F lies in the sum $M + p\mathrm{Sym}^r\mathbb{Z}_p^2$ and $[g, F]$ lies in the sum of the $\mathbb{Z}_p[G]$-submodule generated by $[\mathrm{Id}, M]$ and $p\Lambda^0$.

Hence, it is enough to show that $[\alpha, Y^r]$ and $[1, \theta^2 F'(X, Y)]$, for $F'(X, Y) \in \mathrm{Sym}^{r-2p-2}\mathbb{Z}_p^2$, are in $\ker\psi + p\Lambda^0$, as this last module is G-stable. To do this we recall the computations described in [BG09, Rem. 4.4] of $(T - a_p)f$ used to show that $\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G X_r$ and $\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G V_r^{**}$ go to zero under the map $\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G V_r \to \bar{\Theta}$. Indeed, computing $(T - a_p)f \in \ker\pi \subset \ker\psi$, for $f = [\mathrm{Id}, (\theta/X)Y^{r-p}]$, we see that $[\alpha, Y^r] \in \ker\pi + p\Lambda^0 + a_p\Lambda^0 \subset \ker\pi + p\Lambda^0 + p\mathfrak{m}_E\Lambda \subset p\Lambda^0 + \ker\psi$, since $a_p \equiv p(1-r) \mod p\mathfrak{m}_E$, and both $\ker\pi$ and $p\ker\bar{\pi}$ are in $\ker\psi$ (cf. Lemma 7.47). Similarly, computing $(T-a_p)f$, for $f = [\mathrm{Id}, (1/a_p)\theta^2F']$, we get $[\mathrm{Id}, \theta^2F'] \in \ker\pi + p(p/a_p)\Lambda^0 \subset \ker\pi + p\Lambda^0 + p\mathfrak{m}_E\Lambda \subset \ker\psi + p\Lambda^0$, since $p/a_p \equiv 1/(1-r) \mod \mathfrak{m}_E$.

The argument above shows that, up to $\ker\psi$, each of the functions $[\alpha, Y^r]$ and $[\mathrm{Id}, \theta^2F']$ is of the form -pz, for some $z \in \Lambda^0$, and that z is independent of a_p (it only depends on $a_p/p \mod \mathfrak{m}_E$, which is fixed to be $\overline{(1-r)}$ in our case). ☐

We also have:

Lemma 7.51. *$\psi(\delta\Lambda) \subset N$.*

Proof. Let z be an element of Λ. Then $\pi(z)$ is an element of $\hat{\Theta}$. Write it as $\pi(z) = s_1 + s_2 + s_3$, with $s_i \in S_i$. Then the δs_i and hence $\pi(\delta z)$ are in Θ', and $\psi(\delta z)$ is the sum of the reductions of the δs_i, for $i = 1, 2, 3$. But δS_1 and δS_3 die in $\bar{\Theta}'$, by Lemma 7.47. Thus $\psi(\delta z)$ is equal to the reduction of $\delta s_2 \in S_1'$, which by definition, lies in N. ☐

7.7.6. *A linear form on N.* M is an extension of ω by $N = \mathrm{St} \otimes \omega$, so it is of the form $E_\tau \otimes \omega$ for some τ. We need to compute τ in order to see if the extension given by $V(\bar{\Theta}')$ is "peu ramifiée" or "très ramifiée".

We fix μ a linear form on N as in Lemma 7.8. Recall that the element $X^{p-1} \in J_0 = V_{p-1} \otimes D$ corresponds to the image of θX^s in P, for $s = r-p-1$, by Lemma 3.4 (i). Thus the image of $[\mathrm{Id}, \theta X^s]$ generates $F_0 = \bar{M}_2 = \pi(p-1, 1, \omega)$ inside $\bar{\Theta}$. By Lemma 7.51, the image of $\delta\Lambda$ in $\bar{\Theta}'$ lies in the subrepresentation N of M. In fact, N is the image of δM_2 in $\bar{\Theta}'$, so it is generated as a G-representation by the image of $[\mathrm{Id}, \delta\theta X^s]$. The image of $[\mathrm{Id}, \delta\theta X^s]$ actually lies in $N^{I(1)}$, as we can easily check, and it is non-zero since it generates N. So by the properties of μ, we know that $\mu([\mathrm{Id}, \delta\theta X^s]) \neq 0$. We normalize μ by setting $\mu([\mathrm{Id}, \delta\theta X^s]) = 1$. As $w[\mathrm{Id}, \delta\theta X^s] = -[\mathrm{Id}, \delta\theta Y^s]$ we see that $\mu([\mathrm{Id}, \delta\theta Y^s]) = -1$. Also, since α lies in A up to an element of Z, we have $\mu(\psi(\alpha\delta z)) = \mu(\psi(\delta z))$, for all $z \in \Lambda$, by the equivariance of μ under the action of A. These last three properties of μ will be enough for the computations.

For later use in Section 7.7.8 we prove the following lemma. As in Section 7.7.3 and the proof of Proposition 7.45, we decorate by a superscript ^{0} all objects for $a_p^0 = p(1-r)$.

Lemma 7.52. *Let a_p be an element for which $\delta = p$. Then $\mu(\psi(pz)) = \mu^0(\psi^0(pz))$, for all $z \in \Lambda^0$.*

Proof. This is true by construction of μ and μ^0, for $z = z_0 := [\mathrm{Id}, \theta X^s] \in \Lambda^0$.

Since $N \cong N^0 \otimes k_E$, there is a G-equivariant map from N^0 to N. Any such map takes $I(1)$-invariants to $I(1)$-invariants. Let $\lambda : N^0 \to N$ be the unique G-equivariant map sending $\psi^0([\mathrm{Id}, p\theta X^s])$ to $\psi([\mathrm{Id}, p\theta X^s])$. Then $\mu^0 = \mu \circ \lambda$, by the uniqueness of the linear form μ (see Lemma 7.8). As $\psi(pz_0) = \lambda(\psi^0(pz_0))$, and ψ, ψ^0 and λ are G-equivariant, we get that $\psi(pz) = \lambda(\psi^0(pz))$, for all $z \in \mathbb{Z}_p[G]z_0$, hence by applying μ, $\mu(\psi(pz)) = \mu^0(\psi^0(pz))$, for all $z \in \mathbb{Z}_p[G]z_0$.

For an arbitrary $z \in \Lambda^0$, we can write $z = b_1 + b_2 + b_3 + x$, for b_i in the subspace of Λ^0 generated by $\mathcal{B}'_i$ and for some $x \in \ker \bar{\pi}^0$. Note that $\bar{\pi}^0(\mathbb{Z}_p[G]z_0)$ is the subspace F_0 of $\bar{\Theta}^0$, generated by $\bar{\pi}^0(\mathcal{B}'_1)$ and $\bar{\pi}^0(\mathcal{B}'_2)$. So $\bar{\pi}^0(b_1 + b_2) \in \bar{\pi}^0(\mathbb{Z}_p[G]z_0)$ and we can write $b_1 + b_2 = z_1 + x'$, for some $z_1 \in \mathbb{Z}_p[G]z_0$ and $x' \in \ker \bar{\pi}^0$. Hence we have $z = z_1 + z'$, where $z_1 \in \mathbb{Z}_p[G]z_0$ and $z' := b_3 + x + x'$.

Note that $\pi^0(b_3) \in S_3^0$, $\pi(b_3) \in S_3$ and $x, x' \in \ker \bar{\pi}^0 \subset \ker \bar{\pi}$ (considering $\ker \bar{\pi}^0$ as a part of Λ via the inclusion $\Lambda^0 \subset \Lambda$), by Corollary 7.44. Hence pz' lies in both $\ker \psi$ and $\ker \psi^0$, by Lemma 7.47. So $\mu(\psi(pz)) = \mu(\psi(pz_1))$ and $\mu^0(\psi^0(pz)) = \mu^0(\psi^0(pz_1))$. But we have already shown $\mu(\psi(pz_1)) = \mu^0(\psi^0(pz_1))$ and thus we are done. □

Let $e' = [\mathrm{Id}, \theta X^s] + [\alpha, \theta Y^s] \in \Lambda$, so that $\pi(e') \in S_1 \subset \Theta'$, and let $e = \psi(e') \in \bar{\Theta}'$. Then e is an element of M which is not in N. Let $\gamma_0 = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} 1+p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{smallmatrix}\right)$ and $\gamma_1 = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{smallmatrix}\right)$. Then according to Section 7.3.3, to know τ it suffices to compute $\mu(\gamma_0 e - e)$ and $\mu(\gamma_1 e - e)$.

7.7.7. *The case $v(\delta) < 1$.*

Proposition 7.53. *$\mu(\gamma_0 e - e) = 0$.*

Proof. We have $\gamma_0 e' - e' \in p\Lambda$, so $\psi(\gamma_0 e' - e') = 0$, by Lemma 7.47. So $\gamma_0 e = e$ and $\mu(\gamma_0 e - e) = 0$. □

Proposition 7.54. *$\mu(\gamma_1 e - e) = 2$.*

Proof. We have $\gamma_1 e' = [g^0_{1,0}, \theta X^s] + [\mathrm{Id}, \theta Y^s]$, so $\gamma_1 e' - e' = [g^0_{1,0}, \theta X^s] + [\mathrm{Id}, \theta Y^s] - [\mathrm{Id}, \theta X^s] - [\alpha, \theta Y^s]$.

The computations in the proof of Proposition 6.7 show that

$$\sum_{\lambda \in \mathbb{F}_p} [g^0_{1,[\lambda]}, \theta X^s] - u(a_p)[\mathrm{Id}, \theta X^s] \in \ker \pi + p\Lambda. \tag{7.2}$$

Indeed, taking f as in that proof, we have $(T - a_p)f$ is integral by (6.4), so is in $\ker \pi$. Then the inclusion above follows, multiplying (6.4) by $u(a_p) = \frac{2c}{2-r}$, which is a unit in this section, and by noting that $[g, X^r] \in \ker \pi + p\Lambda$, for $g \in G$.

Applying the matrix $-w = -\left(\begin{smallmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{smallmatrix}\right)$ on the left hand side of (7.2) and going mod $p\Lambda$, we get

$$\sum_{\lambda \in \mathbb{F}_p^*} [g^0_{1,[\lambda]}, \theta X^s] + [\alpha, \theta Y^s] - u(a_p)[\mathrm{Id}, \theta Y^s] \in \ker \pi + p\Lambda, \tag{7.3}$$

using $wg^0_{1,[\lambda]} = g^0_{1,[\lambda]^{-1}} \left(\begin{smallmatrix} 0 & -[\lambda]^{-1} \\ [\lambda] & p \end{smallmatrix}\right) w$, for $\lambda \in \mathbb{F}_p^*$, and $wg^0_{1,0} = \alpha w$. Subtracting (7.3) from (7.2), and writing $u(a_p) = 1 + \delta$, we have

$$[g^0_{1,0}, \theta X^s] - [\mathrm{Id}, \theta X^s] + [\mathrm{Id}, \theta Y^s] - [\alpha, \theta Y^s] + ([\mathrm{Id}, \delta\theta Y^s] - [\mathrm{Id}, \delta\theta X^s]) \in \ker \pi + p\Lambda.$$

Since $v(\delta) < 1$, we have $\psi(\gamma_1 e' - e') = \psi([\mathrm{Id}, \delta\theta X^s] - [\mathrm{Id}, \delta\theta Y^s])$, by Lemma 7.47. Hence the result. □

So we have proved the following proposition, which gives part (1) of Theorem 7.34.

Proposition 7.55. *If $v(\delta) < 1$, then the extension $0 \to N \to M \to \omega \to 0$ is non-split, where $M \cong E_\tau \otimes \omega$, with $[\tau] = (0 : 1)$.*

7.7.8. *The case $\delta = p$.*

Proposition 7.56. $\mu(\gamma_0 e - e) = 3r - 2$.

Proof. In the lattice Λ we have $\gamma_0 e' - e' - p([\mathrm{Id}, s\theta X^s - X^{r-p}Y^p] - [\alpha, XY^{r-1}]) \in p^2\Lambda$. So

$$\mu(\gamma_0 e - e) = s - \mu(\psi([\mathrm{Id}, pX^{r-p}Y^p])) - \mu(\psi([\alpha, pXY^{r-1}])),$$

by Lemma 7.47. Note that $\mu(\psi([\alpha, pXY^{r-1}])) = \mu(\psi([\mathrm{Id}, pXY^{r-1}]))$, by the equivariance of μ with respect to the action of A.

We know from Lemma 7.32 that the image of

$$F'(X,Y) = X^{r-1}Y + (r/2)\theta X^{r-2p}Y^{p-1} - (r/2)\theta Y^s - (1 - r/2)\theta X^s \tag{7.4}$$

in V_r lies in $X_r + V_r^{**}$. So, by Lemma 7.48, and using that $X^{r-p}Y^p = X^{r-1}Y - \theta X^s$, we have $\mu(\psi([\mathrm{Id}, pX^{r-p}Y^p])) = (-r/2)\mu(\psi([\mathrm{Id}, p\theta X^{r-2p}Y^{p-1}])) - r$. Applying w to $F'(X,Y)$, we see that the image of

$$XY^{r-1} - (r/2)\theta X^{r-2p}Y^{p-1} + (r/2)\theta X^s + (1 - r/2)\theta Y^s$$

in V_r is also in $X_r + V_r^{**}$ (note that $(r/2)\theta X^{r-2p}Y^{p-1}$ and $(r/2)\theta X^{p-1}Y^{r-2p}$ have the same image in V_r/V_r^{**}, for $r \geq 2p$). So by Lemma 7.48, we have $\mu(\psi([\mathrm{Id}, pXY^{r-1}])) = (r/2)\mu(\psi([\mathrm{Id}, p\theta X^{r-2p}Y^{p-1}])) + 1 - r$. So finally $\mu(\gamma_0 e - e) = 3r - 2$. ☐

Proposition 7.57. *$\mu(\gamma_1 e - e) = 2\bar{t} + c$, where $\bar{t}$ is the image in k_E of $t \in R$ with $u(a_p) = 1 + tp$, and $c \in \mathbb{F}_p$ is independent of a_p.*

Lemma 7.58. *There are elements z and z' in Λ^0, independent of a_p, such that*

$$\sum_{\lambda \in \mathbb{F}_p} [g^0_{1,[\lambda]}, \theta X^s] - u(a_p)[\mathrm{Id}, \theta X^s] + pz \in \ker \psi$$

and

$$\sum_{\lambda \in \mathbb{F}_p^*} [g^0_{1,[\lambda]}, \theta X^s] + [\alpha, \theta Y^s] - u(a_p)[\mathrm{Id}, \theta Y^s] + pz' \in \ker \psi.$$

Proof. The existence of z can be proven by revisiting carefully the computations leading to the proof of Proposition 6.7. The existence of z' then follows by applying the matrix $-w$ as in the proof of Proposition 7.54. ☐

Proof of Proposition 7.57. Let z and z' be the elements, independent of a_p, in Λ^0, from Lemma 7.58. We set $c = \mu(\psi(pz' - pz)) \in \bar{\mathbb{F}}_p$. By Lemma 7.52, we have $c = \mu^0(\psi^0(pz' - pz)) \in \mathbb{F}_p$. Since $u(a_p) = 1 + tp$, as in the proof of Proposition 7.54, we see that $\psi(\gamma_1 e' - e') = \bar{t}\psi([\mathrm{Id}, p\theta X^s] - [\mathrm{Id}, p\theta Y^s]) + \psi(pz' - pz)$. Hence $\mu(\gamma_1 e - e) = 2\bar{t} + c$. ☐

Proposition 7.59. *If $\delta = p$, then the extension $0 \to N \to M \to \omega \to 0$ is non-split and $[\tau]$ is of the form $(1 : x)$, for some $x \in k_E$. Moreover, for any fixed r ($\not\equiv 1, 2/3 \mod p$), as a_p varies, all values of $x \in \bar{\mathbb{F}}_p$ can occur.*

Proof. The first statement follows from Proposition 7.56, since $3r-2 \not\equiv 0 \mod p$.

Now let us fix $r \not\equiv 1, 2/3 \mod p$. Given any $x \in \bar{\mathbb{F}}_p$, let t be a lift of $\frac{\overline{(3r-2)}x-c}{2} \in \bar{\mathbb{F}}_p$ in some unramified extension of $\mathbb{Z}_p$. Then the equation $u(a_p) = 1 + tp$ gives rise to a quadratic polynomial in a_p/p, one of whose roots reduces to $\overline{(1-r)}$, hence is a unit. Note that if $p \mid 2-r$, then this root lies in an unramified extension of $\mathbb{Z}_p$. This gives us a p-adic integer a_p with $v(a_p) = 1$ such that a_p is close to $\varepsilon p(1-r)$ for $\varepsilon = 1$, and moreover $E = \mathbb{Q}_p(a_p)$ is unramified when $p \mid 2-r$. Therefore the corresponding τ satisfies $[\tau] = (3r-2 : 2\bar{t} + c) = (1 : x)$, as desired. □

This completes the proof of Theorem 7.34.

7.8. **Trivial semisimplification.** In this section we make some remarks about the case when $\bar{V}_{k,a_p}^{ss}$ is the trivial representation, up to a twist.

Assume that the reduction $\bar{V}_{k,a_p}$ of a given $G_{\mathbb{Q}_p}$-stable lattice in V_{k,a_p} is a non-split extension of the trivial representation 1 by 1, up to a twist. Then one can ask whether, after the same twist, the reduction is unramified or ramified. More precisely, the cocycle describing the (twist of the) reduction is just a non-zero map from $G_{\mathbb{Q}_p}$ to $\bar{\mathbb{F}}_p$ lying in the cohomology group $\mathrm{H}^1(G_{\mathbb{Q}_p}, \bar{\mathbb{F}}_p) \cong \bar{\mathbb{F}}_p^2$, and is again well-defined up to a constant. We say that (the twist of) $\bar{V}_{k,a_p}$ is unramified if this map factors through the Galois group of the maximal unramified extension of $\mathbb{Q}_p$, and is ramified otherwise. In the context of Theorem 1.1, this question arises in exactly one case, namely when

(3) $a = 1$, $r \geq 3p-2$, p divides r and $\lambda = \pm\bar{1}$, so $\overline{\frac{a_p}{p}} = \lambda \pm \overline{\sqrt{r/p}}$.

It is known, see [BC14, Prop. 11], that the $G_{\mathbb{Q}_p}$-stable lattices in this setting (when the semisimplification of the reduction is a direct sum of equal characters) form a convex, bounded subset of the tree, whose interior vertices have full valency and correspond to lattices whose reduction is split, and whose extremal vertices have valency one and correspond to lattices whose reduction is non-split. In particular, since there may be a large number of extremal vertices, there may be a large number of non-homothetic $G_{\mathbb{Q}_p}$-stable lattices to study.

We shall answer this question now, but only for the lattice in V_{k,a_p} corresponding to the standard lattice $\Theta = \Theta_{k,a_p}$ on the automorphic side.

We let $p \geq 3$ (allowing $p = 3$ in this subsection). Assume that $r > 2p$, with $r \equiv 1 \mod (p-1)$, so $a = 1$, and that $p \mid r$. Assume, for simplicity, that $\lambda = 1$. We showed (Propositions 5.2, and 5.3 with $c = 2$) that $\bar{\Theta}$, the reduction of the standard lattice, is isomorphic to $\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^{G}(V_{p-2} \otimes D)/(T-1)^2$. The following theorem shows that the corresponding (twist of the) reduction $\bar{V}_{k,a_p} \otimes \omega^{-1}$ is an unramified non-split extension of G_p, as mentioned in the Introduction.

Theorem 7.60. *Let* $\Pi = (\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^{G} V_{p-2})/(T-1)^2$. *Then* $V(\Pi)$ *is a non-split, unramified, extension of the trivial mod p representation by itself.*

7.8.1. *The Jacquet module.* Let B be the Borel subgroup of G consisting of upper-triangular matrices. Let N be the normal subgroup of B consisting of unipotent matrices in B, that is, elements of the form $n(x) = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} 1 & x \\ 0 & 1 \end{smallmatrix}\right)$, for $x \in \mathbb{Q}_p$.

Let k be a finite extension of $\mathbb{F}_p$ and let Π be a smooth representation of G over k. We denote by $\Pi(N)$ the subspace generated by all elements $n(x)v - v$ for $x \in \mathbb{Q}_p$, $v \in \Pi$. Then $\Pi(N)$ is stable by B as B normalizes N, so the quotient $J(\Pi) = \Pi/\Pi(N)$ is a representation of B, and is called the Jacquet module of Π.

We recall two results about the Jacquet module in the mod p setting from Colmez [Col10]. The following lemma is a consequence of [Col10, Proposition VII.1.2].

Lemma 7.61. *Let χ be a smooth character of B with values in $k^\times$. Suppose that $\Pi = \mathrm{Ind}_B^G \chi$ (smooth induction) is irreducible. Then $J(\Pi)$ is isomorphic to χ as a B-representation. Moreover, the natural surjective map $\Pi \to J(\Pi)$ is given by evaluation at $\left(\begin{smallmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{smallmatrix}\right)$, in the description of Π as the set $\{f : G \to k$ locally constant satisfying $f(bg) = \chi(b)f(g)$, for all $b \in B$, $g \in G\}$.*

Now let $\tau : \mathbb{Q}_p^\times \to k$ a continuous character. We define a continuous mod p representation $V_\tau = k^2$ of $G_{\mathbb{Q}_p}$ of dimension 2 as follows. We let $g \in G_p$ act in the standard basis of V_τ by $\left(\begin{smallmatrix} 1 & \tau(g) \\ 0 & 1 \end{smallmatrix}\right)$. Clearly, this representation is unramified if and only if τ is unramified.

We also define a smooth representation $Y_\tau = k^2$ of B of dimension 2 as follows (cf. Remarque VII.4.11 of [Col10]). We let $\beta = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} a & b \\ 0 & d \end{smallmatrix}\right) \in B$ act in the standard basis of Y_τ by $\left(\begin{smallmatrix} 1 & \tau(d/a) \\ 0 & 1 \end{smallmatrix}\right)$.

Recall that $\pi(p-2,1,1)$ is isomorphic to $\mathrm{Ind}_B^G(1 \otimes \omega^{-1})$. Then we have (Proposition VII.4.10, Remarque VII.4.11 and Proposition VII.4.12 of [Col10]):

Proposition 7.62. *Let Π be an extension of $\pi(p-2,1,1)$ by itself. Then $J(\Pi)$ is an extension of the representation $1 \otimes \omega^{-1}$ of B by itself and is of the form $Y_\tau \otimes (1 \otimes \omega^{-1})$, for some τ. Moreover, $V(\Pi)$ is isomorphic to V_τ.*

7.8.2. *Proof of Theorem 7.60.*

Lemma 7.63. *Let $j : \pi(p-2,1,1) \to J(\pi(p-2,1,1))$ be the natural B-equivariant morphism. Let f be the image of $[1, Y^{p-2}]$ in $\pi(p-2,1,1)$. Then $j(f) \neq 0$.*

Proof. We use Lemma 7.61 and the isomorphism $\pi(p-2,1,1) \to \mathrm{Ind}_B^G(1 \otimes \omega^{-1})$ of Section 6 of [BL94], which we shall call ϕ. It suffices to show that $\phi(f)$, seen as a function on G, is not zero at $\left(\begin{smallmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{smallmatrix}\right)$, and this is a consequence of the explicit description of ϕ given in [BL94, Section 6.2]. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 7.60. We have an extension:

$$1 \to (T-1)(\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G V_{p-2})/(T-1)^2 \to \Pi \overset{u}{\to} (\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G V_{p-2})/(T-1) \to 1.$$

Also denote by j the natural map $\Pi \to J(\Pi)$ (as well as the natural map $\pi(p-2,1,1) \to J(\pi(p-2,1,1))$). By Proposition 7.62, after applying the Jacquet functor we have an extension:

$$1 \to J(\pi(p-2,1,1)) \to J(\Pi) \overset{J(u)}{\to} J(\pi(p-2,1,1)) \to 1,$$

where $J(\pi(p-2,1,1))$ is isomorphic to $1 \otimes \omega^{-1}$ as a B-representation (by Lemma 7.61), and $J(\Pi)$ is isomorphic to $Y_\tau \otimes (1 \otimes \omega^{-1})$, for some τ.

We can compute τ as follows. Take an element f in Π with non-zero image $j(u(f))$ in $J(\pi(p-2,1,1))$. For $\beta = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} a & b \\ 0 & d \end{smallmatrix}\right) \in B$, compute $j(\beta(f) - (1 \otimes \omega^{-1})(\beta)f)$, which is an element of $j((T-1)(\operatorname{ind}_{KZ}^{G} \sigma_{p-2})/(T-1)^2)$, and so can also be written as $(1 \otimes \omega^{-1})(\beta)\tau(a^{-1}d)j((T-1)f)$. So computing for enough β determines τ.

Using Lemma 7.63, we take for f the image of the element $[1, Y^{p-2}]$ in Π. Take first $\beta = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & d \end{smallmatrix}\right)$, for $d \in \mathbb{Z}_p^{\times}$. Then $\beta(f) = d^{p-2}f = (1 \otimes \omega^{-1})(\beta)(f)$. So $j(\beta(f) - (1 \otimes \omega^{-1})(\beta)(f)) = 0$ and $\tau(d) = 0$.

Now take $\beta = \alpha = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & p \end{smallmatrix}\right)$. Then

$$\beta(f) - (1 \otimes \omega^{-1})(\beta)(f) \quad = \quad [\alpha, Y^{p-2}] - [1, Y^{p-2}] = (T-1)[1, Y^{p-2}] - \sum_{\lambda \in \mathbb{F}_p^{\times}} [g_{1,\lambda}^{0}, (-\lambda)^{p-2} X^{p-2}].$$

We claim that $j(\sum_{\lambda \in \mathbb{F}_p^{\times}} [g_{1,\lambda}^{0}, (-\lambda)^{p-2} X^{p-2}]) = 0$. Indeed,

$$[g_{1,\lambda}^{0}, X^{p-2}] - [g_{1,0}^{0}, X^{p-2}] = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} 1 & [\lambda] \\ 0 & 1 \end{smallmatrix}\right)[g_{1,0}^{0}, X^{p-2}] - [g_{1,0}^{0}, X^{p-2}],$$

so is an element of $\Pi(N)$, so $j(\sum_{\lambda \in \mathbb{F}_p^{\times}} [g_{1,\lambda}^{0}, (-\lambda)^{p-2} X^{p-2}]) = j([g_{1,0}^{0}, \sum_{\lambda \in \mathbb{F}_p^{\times}} (-\lambda)^{p-2} X^{p-2}])$, and the claim follows, since $\sum_{\lambda \in \mathbb{F}_p^{\times}} (-\lambda)^{p-2} = 0$. It follows that

$$j(\beta(f) - (1 \otimes \omega^{-1})(\beta)(f)) = j((T-1)[1, Y^{p-2}]),$$

which gives $\tau(p) = 1$.

Thus τ is a non-zero, unramified map $\mathbb{Q}_p^{\times} \to k$, which gives the result by Proposition 7.62. $\square$

8. Examples

In this final section we compare our general theorems with some specific examples in the literature, and also provide some new information about these examples.

Consider the Delta function $\Delta = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \tau(n) q^n$, the unique normalized cusp form of level 1 and weight $k = 12$. It is known that the only primes $p < 10^6$ for which Δ has positive slope (i.e., $p \mid \tau(p) = a_p$) are $p = 2$, 3, 5, 7 and 2,411, though recently it seems to have been discovered that the 10 digit prime $p = 7{,}758{,}337{,}633$ is also of positive slope. Serre and Swinnerton-Dyer [Ser73] computed the global reduction of the Galois representations attached to cuspforms of level 1 and small weight, for small primes p in order to explain congruences going back to Ramanujan. In particular, they proved that the shape of $\bar{\rho}_{\Delta}^{\mathrm{ss}} : G_{\mathbb{Q}} \to \mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{F}_p)$, for $p \leq 7$, is as follows:

- If $p = 2$, so $\tau(p) = -24$ and $v(a_p) = 3$, then $\bar{\rho}_{\Delta}^{ss}$ is trivial.
- If $p = 3$, so $\tau(p) = 252$ and $v(a_p) = 2$, then $\bar{\rho}_{\Delta}^{ss} \cong \begin{pmatrix} \omega & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$.
- If $p = 5$, so $\tau(p) = 4{,}830$ and $v(a_p) = 1$, then $\bar{\rho}_{\Delta}^{ss} \cong \begin{pmatrix} \omega & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \otimes \omega$.
- If $p = 7$, so $\tau(p) = -16{,}744$, then $v(a_p) = 1$ and $\bar{\rho}_{\Delta}^{ss} \cong \begin{pmatrix} \omega^3 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \otimes \omega$.

For primes p of positive slope, the restriction of $\bar{\rho}_{\Delta}^{ss}$ to $G_{\mathbb{Q}_p}$ is isomorphic to $\bar{V}_{12,\tau(p)}^{ss}$, at least if $\tau(p)^2 \neq 4p^{11}$, so one may compare the results above for slope 1 with the results in this paper. The primes $p \geq 11$ are in the well understood Fontaine-Laffaille range $2 \leq k \leq p+1$, covered by the work of Edixhoven [Edi92] (for all positive slopes), so we do not comment further on these primes here. Also, the restriction of $\bar{\rho}_\Delta^{\mathrm{ss}}$ above to $G_{\mathbb{Q}_p}$ when $p = 7$ matches with what was computed by Breuil [Bre03b] who treated weights $k \leq 2p+1$ for all positive slopes (though the case $k = 2p+1$ was only later stated in [Ber11]).

We now consider the case $p = 5$. In this case, the shape of the global representation $\bar{\rho}_\Delta^{ss}$ above explains the congruence $\tau(n) \equiv n\sigma_1(n) \mod 5$, for all $n \geq 1$. We show that the restriction of $\bar{\rho}_\Delta^{ss}$ to $G_{\mathbb{Q}_p}$ matches with what is predicted in general by Theorem 1.1. In the notation of that theorem, we have $r = 10 \equiv 2 \mod (p-1)$, so $b = 2$. Moreover

$$v\left(\frac{a_p}{p} - \binom{r}{2}\frac{p}{a_p}\right) = 0 = v(2-r),$$

so we are in the middle case of the trichotomy there. Since

$$\lambda \quad \equiv \quad \frac{2}{2-r}\left(\frac{a_p}{p} - \binom{r}{2}\frac{p}{a_p}\right) \quad \equiv \quad -\frac{2}{8}(966) \quad \equiv \quad 1 \mod p,$$

the unramified characters $\mu_{\lambda^{\pm 1}}$ are trivial, and we recover that $(\bar{\rho}_\Delta|_{G_{\mathbb{Q}_p}})^{ss} \cong \omega^2 \oplus \omega$.

But we can say more. Since $\frac{a_p}{p} \equiv 1 \equiv \varepsilon(1-r) \mod p$ with $\varepsilon = 1$, and $v(u - \varepsilon)$ is necessarily ≥ 1 being a positive integer, we deduce by Theorem 1.3 that when $p = 5$,

$$\bar{\rho}_\Delta|_{G_{\mathbb{Q}_p}} \quad \text{is a très ramifiée extension,}$$

whenever it is a non-split extension of ω by ω^2.

We remark that the formula for λ above simplifies to the more naïve one occurring for $3 \leq b \leq p-1$ in Theorem 1.1, whenever $\binom{r}{2} \equiv 0 \mod p$, and in particular when $p \mid r$, as was the case above. We now give an example to show that the more complicated formula above for λ when $b = 2$ is indeed required. Consider instead Δ_{16}, the unique cusp form of level 1 and weight $k = 16$, and again take $p = 5$. Then $p \parallel a_p = 52,110$, so $v(a_p) = 1$. Also $r = 14$ so $b = 2$ as before, and

$$\lambda \quad \equiv \quad -\frac{2}{12}\left(10,422 - \frac{7 \cdot 13}{10,422}\right) \quad \equiv \quad 1 \mod p,$$

compared to the more naïve (and incorrect) $\lambda = 3$, and we again recover the result that $(\bar{\rho}_{\Delta_{16}}|_{G_{\mathbb{Q}_p}})^{ss} \cong \omega^2 \oplus \omega$, for $p = 5$, from [Ser73]. We also remark that Theorem 1.3 provides no extra information in this example, since $r \equiv 2/3 \mod p$.

For other examples, for small values of k and p, we refer the reader to [Roz16], where an algorithm to compute $\bar{V}_{k,a_p}^{ss}$ is described and implemented for all positive slopes.

Acknowledgements: The first author was supported by grant 1246/2014 from the Germany-Israel Foundation for Scientific Research and Development. This work was partly supported by the NSF under Grant No. 0932078 000, while the second and third authors were in residence at MSRI during the Fall 2014 semester. The second author would like to thank Princeton University and University of British Columbia for their hospitality during the period April-June, 2015 and October 2015. The third author was partially supported by the ANR grant PerCoLaTor (ANR 14-CE25).

References

[Ars15] Bodan Arsovski, *Reduction modulo p of two-dimensional crystalline representations of $G_{\mathbb{Q}_p}$ of slope less than three*, Preprint (2015), arXiv:1503.08309.

[BC14] Joël Bellaïche and Gaëtan Chenevier, *Sous-groupes de* GL_2 *et arbres*, J. Algebra **410** (2014), 501–525. MR 3201061

[BL94] Laure Barthel and Ron Livné, *Irreducible modular representations of* GL_2 *of a local field*, Duke Math. J. **75** (1994), no. 2, 261–292. MR 1290194 (95g:22030)

[BL95] ———, *Modular representations of* GL_2 *of a local field: the ordinary, unramified case*, J. Number Theory **55** (1995), no. 1, 1–27. MR 1361556 (96m:22036)

[Ber10] Laurent Berger, *Représentations modulaires de* $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbf{Q}_p)$ *et représentations galoisiennes de dimension 2*, Astérisque (2010), no. 330, 263–279. MR 2642408 (2011g:11104)

[Ber11] ———, *La correspondance de Langlands locale p-adique pour* $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbf{Q}_p)$, Astérisque (2011), no. 339, Exp. No. 1017, viii, 157–180, Séminaire Bourbaki. Vol. 2009/2010. Exposés 1012–1026. MR 2906353 (2012k:11186)

[BB] Laurent Berger and Christophe Breuil, *Sur la réduction des représentations cristallines de dimension 2 en poids moyens.*

[BLZ04] Laurent Berger, Hanfeng Li and Hui June Zhu, *Construction of some families of 2-dimensional crystalline representations*, Math. Ann. **329** (2004), no. 2, 365–377. MR 2060368 (2005k:11104)

[BG15] Shalini Bhattacharya and Eknath Ghate, *Reductions of Galois representations for slopes in* $(1, 2)$, Doc. Math. **20** (2015), 943–987.

[Bre03a] Christophe Breuil, *Sur quelques représentations modulaires et p-adiques de* $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbf{Q}_p)$*. I.* Compositio Math. **138** (2003), no. 2, 165–188. MR 2018825

[Bre03b] ———, *Sur quelques représentations modulaires et p-adiques de* $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbf{Q}_p)$ *II*, J. Inst. Math. Jussieu **2** (2003), no. 1, 23–58. MR 1955206 (2005d:11079)

[BM02] Christophe Breuil and Ariane Mézard, *Multiplicités modulaires et représentations de* $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbf{Z}_p)$ *et de* $\mathrm{Gal}(\overline{\mathbf{Q}}_p/\mathbf{Q}_p)$ *en $l = p$. With an appendix by Guy Henniart*, Duke Math. J. **115** (2002), no. 2, 205–310.

[BG09] Kevin Buzzard and Toby Gee, *Explicit reduction modulo p of certain two-dimensional crystalline representations*, Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN (2009), no. 12, 2303–2317. MR 2511912 (2010g:11201)

[BG13] ———, *Explicit reduction modulo p of certain 2-dimensional crystalline representations, II*, Bull. Lond. Math. Soc. **45** (2013), no. 4, 779–788. MR 3081546

[Col10] Pierre Colmez, *Représentations de* $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbf{Q}_p)$ *et* (φ, Γ)*-modules*, Astérisque (2010), no. 330, 281–509. MR 2642409 (2011j:11224)

[Edi92] Bas Edixhoven, *The weight in Serre's conjectures on modular forms*, Invent. Math. **109** (1992), no. 3, 563–594. MR 1176206 (93h:11124)

[GG15] Abhik Ganguli and Eknath Ghate, *Reductions of Galois representations via the mod p Local Langlands Correspondence*, J. Number Theory **147** (2015), 250–286. MR 3276325

[Glo78] D. J. Glover, *A study of certain modular representations*, J. Algebra **51** (1978), no. 2, 425–475. MR 0476841 (57 #16392)

[Roz16] Sandra Rozensztajn, *An algorithm for computing the reduction of 2-dimensional crystalline representations of* $\mathrm{Gal}(\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_p/\mathbb{Q}_p)$, Preprint (2016), arXiv:1603.00763.

[Ser73] Jean-Pierre Serre, *Congruences et formes modulaires (d'après H. P. F. Swinnerton-Dyer)*, Séminaire Bourbaki (1971/1972), Exp. No. 416, pp. 319–338. Lecture Notes in Math., Vol. **317**, Springer, Berlin, 1973.

[Ser87] ———, *Sur les représentations modulaires de degré* 2 *de* $\mathrm{Gal}(\overline{\mathbf{Q}}/\mathbf{Q})$, Duke Math. J. **54** (1987), no. 1, 179–230. MR 885783 (88g:11022)

[Vie12] Mathieu Vienney, *Construction de* (φ, Γ)*-modules en caractéristique p*, ENS Lyon Ph D thesis, 2012.

[YY] Go Yamashita and Seidai Yasuda, *Reduction of two dimensional crystalline representations and Hypergeometric polynomials*, In preparation.

Department of Mathematics, Bar-Ilan University, Ramat Gan-5290002, Israel
E-mail address: `shaliniwork16@gmail.com`

School of Mathematics, Tata Institute of Fundamental Research, Homi Bhabha Road, Mumbai-5, India
E-mail address: `eghate@math.tifr.res.in`

UMPA, ÉNS de Lyon, UMR 5669 du CNRS, 46, allée d'Italie, 69364 Lyon Cedex 07, France
E-mail address: `sandra.rozensztajn@ens-lyon.fr`